FIRST EDITION 1944

SECOND EDITION 1966

WITH THANKS FOR COOPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE FOR PRODUCTION OF SELECTED MATERIALS, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah's Correspondence

Edited by

Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada

PUBLISHERS

GUILD PUBLISHING HOUSE
KARACHI

Second Revised Edition

OCTOBER 1966

PRICE Rs. 15.00

PUBLISHERS

GUILD PUBLISHING HOUSE

16 - B, S.M.C.H.S., KARACHI-3

SOLE AGENTS

GUILD-ANJUMAN KITAB GHAR

VICTORIA ROAD, KARACHI

Printed by

Vision Publications, Limited Karachi.

CONTENTS

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

It is a matter of great privelege for us to be the pioneer publishers of the letters of the Quaid-e-Azam (the Great Leader) Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan. This should have been done several years back by some other publishing house or institution but it appears that this honour had been destined to come to the writers' own publishing house.

We are deeply indebted to Mr. Sharifuddin Pirzada, who has compiled this volume after careful scrutiny and hard work. He is one of the most qualified persons to edit this correspondence. He has been a close associate and a passionate admirer of the Great Leader at a stage when the Quaid was fighting the foreign and local opponents for the achievement of Pakistan. Incidentally, as we release this publication, Mr. Pirzada has been appointed as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

The foreword to this book has been written by a very eminent citizen and journalist of our country, Mr. Altaf Husain, who, before joining the Presidential Cabinet in 1965, was the Editor of the daily" Dawn". Mr. Altaf Husain was also a close associate of the Quaid-e-Azam and his lieutenants, knew his mind and qualities of his personality from close quarters. His views are obviously his own, but there can be no doubt about their great value and importance. We are much indebted to Mr. Altaf Husain for this valuable contribution.

We hope that, besides the group of admirers of the Great Leader—which in fact the entire Muslim Nation is—the students of Indo-Pak history, especially research workers will find this book most illuminating, interesting and a source of very useful material.

Jamiluddin Aali

Pakistan Writers' Guild
Karachi, September, 1966

• These letters are arranged in alphabetic order in respect of addressees.

PREFACE

This is a revised edition of a work which first came out in 1943. While the earlier edition contained the Quaid-i-Azam's correspondence during the years 1937-43, the present edition contains selected but rare and important letters which he wrote or received from 1918 to 1948. His last letter has also been included.

The firm hand, the clear vision and steadfast spirit which marked the Quaid-i-Azam's leadership of the Muslim struggle in the Sub-continent, are evident from his letters.

I hope that this collection of correspondence will contribute to a better understanding of the great leader and the role he played in shaping the history of our times, especially in the establishment of Pakistan.

SYED SHARIFUDDIN PIRZADA
S. Pk.

Karachi,

14th August, 1966

FOREWORD

In recent years a few books have been published which are in the nature of historical accounts of the struggle for Pakistan; and biographies of the Quaid-i-Azam have also been attempted. In some of the publications the subjective approach of the author has tended to project itself into the narrative; and a satisfactory and objective biography of the Founder of Pakistan still remains to be written. For those who have attempted the task the main difficulty has been the unavailability of full and authentic source material.

Historical accounts of all freedom movements, and particularly of a movement which culminated in the emergence of a sovereign and independent new State—now populated by well over a hundred million people—should be objective and impersonal not only while narrating the sequence of events but also when describing the policy, the personality, the activities and the achievements of the Leader. Before many more years elapse the generation of Pakistanis who lived through, or participated in the Movement and the struggle, will gradually pass from the scene and a new generation take their place. For this younger element a complete and well documented history setting forth the genesis of and the *raison d'etre* for Pakistan is as important as a correct portraiture of the Great Leader who brought the Muslim struggle to a triumphant and resounding conclusion.

Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada has made a significant contribution to a proper understanding of the Quaid-i-Azam by the generations of today and tomorrow by bringing out this new and enlarged compilation of some of the most important correspondence of the Founder of Pakistan. Of the letters published in this volume, perhaps the most revealing are those that were exchanged between the Quaid-i-Azam and the leaders of Hindu India like Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, as also Sir Mirza Ismail and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. They bring out the Quaid's straightforward, resolute and at the same time reasonable approach on all questions, and they highlight the opposite characteristics of those who were ranged against him. The latter, it will be seen, responded to the Quaid's sincerity with double-meaning and hypocrisy, and to his straightforward propositions by evasions and not unoften by attempts at outright deception. In his replies to the letters of misguided Muslim "Nationalists" and similar other people, the Quaid-i-Azam clearly pointed out where they had erred and how they were playing into the hands of those who were attempting to trap Muslims into accepting solutions which would have led to the enslavement of the entire Muslim nation in a so-called united India ruled by the ruthless brute force of a Hindu majority. It is because the Quaid remained, to the last, untrapped, that Pakistan today is free.

Not less revealing are his exchanges with the last but one British Viceroy of India, Lord Wavell.

The Quaid-i-Azam once told this writer that he had never come across an Englishman "so slippery as Wavell", and this is clearly borne out by the Jinnah-Wavell correspondence, particularly the Quaid's letter to Wavell dated 31st July 1946, in reply to Wavell's letter of 22nd July.

One word about the manner of presentation of the letters in this volume. There are several ways in which correspondence of this nature can be edited, and one of them is the chronological order. In this volume, however, Mr. Pirzada has chosen to present the correspondence not in the chronological order but in sections devoted to letters exchanged between the Quaid-i-Azam on the one hand, and some important personalities on the other. Therefore, the reader begins with the perusal of a letter dated the 20th November 1945 and then quickly passes back to correspondence which took place in 1940 and 1941. Sometimes a letter written in June 1929 is followed by one written in November 1945, and in the very next letter one goes back to April 1942. There is some merit in the system followed by the compiler, because although the reader's mind may jump from page to page in respect of time, he has a better insight into the approach of each correspondent in regard to the specific issues and episodes.

ALTAF HUSAIN

Rawalpindi,
September, 1966

CORRESPONDENCE

LETTER FROM MR. ABBAS KHAN

Dated 20th November, 1945

My dear Quaid-e-Azam,

I beg to inform you that I have tendered my resignation to His Excellency the Governor on the following grounds.

(1) The period of my pact in the N.W.F.P. Coalition Cabinet expires with the life of the present Assembly; which is about to take place and I am now quite free to act as I like;

(2) I believe in the principle and programme of the Muslim League and the ideal of Pakistan for which the Muslim League stands;

(3) It is wrong for any self-respecting Muslim to co-operate with the Congress, which is a Hindu organisation;

(4) I have joined the Muslim League. It has given me immense pleasure to join the Muslim League to serve the Muslim Nation. Henceforth I place myself at the disposal of the only leader of the Muslim Nation, Quaid-e-Azam, and to act in

the interest of Musalmans in any way that you may deem proper.

Yours sincerely,

M. Abbas

* * *

MR. JINNAH'S REPLY

Peshawar,
Dated November 22, 1945

Dear Mr. Abbas,

I am in receipt of your letter of November 20, and I thank you for it. I note your reasons for having joined the Muslim League and that you assure me that you will serve the Muslim Nation. I further thank you for the expression of your confidence and trust in my leadership and I hope that you will play full part in the organisation in a spirit of selfless service, in the interest of the Muslim India and for the achievement of our goal of Pakistan.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

TELEGRAM

ABUL KALAM AZAD

Bombay, 12th July, 1940

From Maulana Azad to Mr. Jinnah

"Confidential. Your July 9 statement: The Congress Delhi resolution definitely means by National Government a composite Cabinet not limited to any single party. But is it the position of the League that she cannot agree to any provisional arrangement not based on the two-nation scheme? If so, please clarify by wire."

MR. JINNAH'S REPLY

"Your telegram cannot reciprocate confidence. I refuse to discuss with you, by correspondence or otherwise, as you have completely forfeited the confidence of Muslim India. Can't you realise you are made a Muslim 'show-boy' Congress President to give it colour that it is national and deceive foreign countries. You represent neither Muslims nor Hindus. The Congress is a Hindu body. If you have self-respect resign at once. You have done your worst against the League so far. You know you have hopelessly failed. Give it up."

February 19, 1941.

* * *

MIR BANDE ALI

Dear Mir Bande Ali,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 15th instant and regret that Shaikh Abdul Majid was not able to

come as he was not well. I hope he is well now. I note also that you could not come for the reasons given in your letter.

I have considered your letter most carefully and have given my best attention to it. Hon. Khan Bahadur Khuro, Sir Abdoola Haroon and myself discussed the whole situation and the question of Sind Ministry in all its bearing and aspects and I have come to the conclusion that it will be most disastrous for you and for the party that you now represent as well as the Provincial Muslim League, Sind, and the All-India Muslim League, to depart from the advice that I have already given, viz, that the present ministry should continue. I have also examined the document that was signed by Mr. Syed and Mr. Khuro and it is absurd to call it a pact or agreement between all parties. You yourself say that you were not a party to it, nor was the Provincial Muslim League, and when Shaikh Abdul Majid was informed about this document he repudiated it. On the strength of this mythical arrangement which on the face of it is nebulous and not an agreement between any party or parties except that it is signed by two individuals, Mr. Syed and Mr. Khuro, and given to Mr. Nichaldas to remain as a secret document, and further as the very first condition viz, that Shaikh was to resign, was not fulfilled, the Hindu and Congress Press are parading this as a pact. On the strength of this Khan Bahadur Allah Bakhsh threatens to create a crisis unless he is installed as a Premier, and Sir Ghulam Hussain is included in the ministry and one of you should go out and make room for him.

The only answer to such an ultimatum is that we cannot surrender. I, therefore, earnestly appeal to you, Shaikh Abdul Majid and Khan Bahadur Khuro to stand together and face the Assembly until you are obliged to resign for want of majority at your back. That seems to me to be the only honourable course for you to adopt.

It is argued that you should not embarrass the Government. But in the event of your Government being defeated and if you have to sit in the Opposition, why is it assumed that the main business of the Opposition would be to embarrass any other Government that may be formed? Why should any Government be embarrassed if the Opposition attacks and criticises the Government in power, when it is the constitutional and legitimate function of the Opposition?

You are asking for the moon, that a parliamentary Government should be run with complete unanimity in the Assembly. In the very nature of the constitution under which you are working it is contemplated that the Government can only be run on healthy lines by a majority plus a constitutional Opposition.

In conclusion I beg of you not to accept any proposal to change the personnel of the ministry without first consulting me and unless it is given to you in writing and is received from responsible quarters, I cannot put any reliance in verbal conversations and verbal proposals.

You must have noticed the interview of Mr. Nichaldas where he has taken up a very pious attitude that so far as the two Hindu Ministers and their party are concerned they are willing to co-operate with the four Muslim Ministers that may be acceptable to the Muslim members of the Assembly, and therefore now the quarrel and dispute is passed on to the Mussalmans. If the Mussalmans do not rise to the occasion and if the solid body of the Mussalmans will not see what is obviously in their interest and if they do not support the Muslim League Ministers then I think in all honesty the League Ministers should not thrust themselves upon the Cabinet but should sit on the Opposition benches and let the public know that the Muslim League is not responsible for that Government.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

MALIK BARKAT ALI

Little Gibbs Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay

20th November, 1937

Dear Mr. Barkat Ali,

I have received a very long letter from Ghulam Rasool and also from Sir Mohammed Iqbal and from

yourself. I have not been well enough to tackle the various details that are referred to there. But it seems to me that it is unnecessary to stress points of detail. May I just state one principle, that once the Muslim members of the Unionist Party or any Mussalman who becomes a Leaguer and pledges himself to the creed, policy and programme, he is no longer anything else but a Leaguer, and those who have been already in the League are not better than the Leaguers. Perhaps you might say that the others have now realised that the policy and the programme which we initiated are the right ones, and hence they wholeheartedly join us. After that there is no such thing as this group or that group, or that party or this party, because then it really means various cliques. And I assure you that if you people have a little patience these small matters of detail will be adjusted fairly and justly and mainly in the interests of the cause for which we stand.

I hope you will show this letter to Sir Mohammed Iqbal and Gulam Rasool. I have appointed some members to the Central Parliamentary Board which was suggested by Sir Sikander Hyat, but that does not mean that I am not going to appoint some other members representing Punjab which may be suggested by Sir Mohammed Iqbal, Malik Zaman Mehdi Khan, Ghulam Rasool and yourself.

I should like most respectfully to draw your attention that you have been using my name for the New Times as one of the patrons, which I am very sorry to say I do not approve of, because I do

not think it is fair that one paper should be allowed to use my name and thereby directly or indirectly conveying to the public that I am connected with the paper, whereas it is not a fact that I have any connection of any kind with the New Times. I welcome the New Times inasmuch as it is advocating and championing the cause of the All-India Muslim League. Therefore, I hope you will not misunderstand me if I request you to stop using my name as a patron of the New Times. I will reply to your letter in detail when I am little better and other also.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah

P.S. I want you to show this letter to all our friends as I am not well enough to reply separately.

* * *

THE BOMBAY REPRESENTATIVE CONFERENCE, 1921

The Nagpur Session of the Congress (1920), the Non-Cooperation Movement and its failure, the Ahmedabad Session of the Congress (1921) and Mr. Gandhi's opposition to the motion for the communal riots and the clash between the cooperators and non-cooperators are the main events which moved independent politicians to come forward to act as intermediaries between the Government and the non-cooperators. An All-

Parties Conference was convened at Bombay in the middle of January 1922, with Sir Vivesvarayya as the Chairman and Jinnah, Jayakar and Nataranjan as Secretaries. This Conference unanimously condemned the Government policy of repression and advised the Congress to abandon the resolution passed at Bardoli, which contemplated the inauguration of mass civil disobedience. It also recommended to the Government an early convening of a Round Table Conference with authority to make a settlement on the questions of Khilafat, Punjab and Swaraj, and with a view to providing a favourable atmosphere, asking for the withdrawal of notifications under Criminal Law Amendment Act, banning organisations, and the Seditious Meetings Act and the release of all political prisoners convicted or under trial under them as also of the Fatwa prisoners. But Mr. Gandhi laid down the condition that all political leaders must be released from jails before any pourparleys could begin with the Viceroy. The promoters of the Conference were utterly helpless as the Viceroy could not see his way to fulfil this condition. On the 1st February 1922, Mr. Gandhi sent to the Viceroy his so-called ultimatum of seven days. But before the time-limit of seven days could expire, a terrible incident took place. On 5th February, 1922, when a procession was being taken out at Chauri Chaura, twenty-one constables and a sub-inspector were rushed at by the mob in the Police Station and the men in it were set fire to. They all perished in the flames. Mr. Gandhi realised the blunder he had committed and on 12th of February the entire movement was called of.

The proceedings and the resolution of the Conference were described in details by Mr. M.R. Jayaker in 'The Story of My Life'. The following is the relevant correspondence regarding the said Conference.

Letter dated 3rd January 1922, issued to important members of the public.

Dear Sir,

The Ahmedabad Congress, by rejecting the motion for Independence and by relaxing the mandatory character of the non-co-operation resolution, has gone some way towards conciliating a large section of the people, which is opposed to forced marches in politics. This section has been recently not very articulate but its influence on that account is not the less decisive.

While the position of the Congress has thus stengthened on one side, the countenance given to the early adoption of aggressive civil disobedience cannot but cause anxiety. It, therefore, behoves us all, both the Government and the people, to strain every nerve to see that civil disobedience is not resorted to, until at least it is far more obvious than at present that the resources of reason and statesmanship have been exhausted.

The great obstacle in the way of attempting this at present is the policy adopted by the Government, within the last few weeks, of extending and applying the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the

Seditious Meetings Act, eventuating in whole-sale arrests and imprisonments, including those of many men of high character and integrity. This policy is, in our opinion, both unjust and unwise, the more so as it comes on the top of the discontent created by the failure, on the part of the Government, to satisfy the demands of the people with reference to the questions relating to the Punjab, the Khilafat and Swaraj. As the Liberal Federation, which met the other day at Allahabad, rightly pointed out, this policy has defeated its own object of alleviating popular sympathy and aggravating the general unrest.

A considerable body of opinion in the country is anxious to see a settlement effected, which would make it possible to secure redress of political grievances and the satisfaction of national aspirations in an atmosphere of peace and harmony. The Ahmedabad Congress, in rejecting the proposal for severing India's connection with the British Empire, has reflected the opinion, still retained by the bulk of thoughtful people in the country, that it is possible to achieve full national development within the orbit of the British Commonwealth. It is, therefore, necessary at this juncture for all those who realise the evil consequences bound to ensue on a continuance of the present deadlock, to confer together and devise means whereby it will be possible to open wide the door to an honourable settlement. It has been suggested that, to consider the situation in all its aspects and to decide upon a course leading to a satisfactory solution of the present difficulties.

If you are in favour of such a Conference please let us know, at your earliest convenience, preferably by wire, whether you will be able to attend the Conference, which is proposed to be held in Bombay on the 14th instant.

Yours truly,

Madan Mohan Malaviya
M. A. Jinnah
M. R. Jayakar
Purshottamdas Thakurdas
Ambala Sarabhai
G. M. Bhurgri

On 16th January 1922, the following letter was addressed to public institutions interested in the question:

Dear Sirs,

We desire that institutions like yours which are working for the advancement of the people should co-operate with our Committee for the purpose of establishing peace and harmony in the country on the basis of an honourable settlement of the points in controversy and we hope that you will give us all the assistance you can in achieving this laudable object. We may add that if you can state for our guidance the opinion of your institution as regards the minimum demands that will satisfy public opinion in your part of the country, with reference to the three questions mentioned above, it will be an advantage.

We can then focus public opinion on the three points in controversy, with the view of making representation to the Government. May we also suggest to you the desirability of educating public opinion, by holding meetings or otherwise, about the necessity, at this critical juncture, of an early conciliation of the public mind? We shall be obliged if we can have an early reply to this letter.

Yours faithfully,

M. A. Jinnah
M. R. Jayakar
K. Nataranjan
Secretaries

Bombay Representative Conference Committee.

On 18th January 1922, the following Resolutions were sent by wire to the Private Secretary of the Viceroy with this note:

Should His Excellency desire further elucidation regarding Conference, Chairman Sir M. Visvesvarya and Secretaries Jinnah and Jayakar, will wait on His Excellency on convenient date. General desire for peaceful, harmonious settlement, strongly reflected in proceeds of Conference

Resolution No. 1

This Conference is strongly of opinion that the policy, adopted by the Government within the last few weeks of extending and applying the

Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Seditious Meetings Act in various parts of the country and of misusing ordinary Laws in connection with political offences, leading to wholesale arrests and imprisonments, including those of some of the most respected leaders and citizens, constitutes an unwarranted encroachment upon the elementary rights of citizenship, of freedom of press and liberty of speech and of association, has defeated its own object by alienating popular sympathy and aggravating the general discontent, and should be reversed without delay.

Resolution No. 2

This Conference is further of opinion that until it is clear beyond any doubt that no other means will secure a redress of the country's grievances than the status of full Responsible Government, the Civil Disobedience contemplated by the Ahmedabad Congress should not be resorted to.

Resolution No. 3

In response to the sentiments expressed by His Excellency the Viceroy in his speech at Calcutta on the 21st December 1921, and in order to explore all methods of reaching a harmonious and honourable settlement of the important issues now before the country, namely the Khilafat, the Punjab wrongs and the demand for Swaraj or Full Responsible Government on the Dominion basis, the Con-

ference supports the proposal for a Round Table Conference between the Government and popular representatives and is of opinion that, in order to provide a favourable atmosphere for the dispassionate consideration of points in controversy, all Notifications and Orders passed by the Government under Act 14 of 1908 Part II and the Seditious Meetings Act should be withdrawn and all prisoners convicted or under arrest or prosecution under the aforesaid Notifications or Orders should be released, as also the Fatwa prisoners and that, inasmuch as prisoners for non-violent activities and other activities of innocent character have been convicted under cover of the ordinary laws, a committee should be appointed by the Government consisting of two persons one nominated by the Government and the other by a committee of this Conference appointed by Resolution No. 5, with powers to them to investigate cases of persons hereinbefore referred to and such of them as might be recommended by the said Round Table Conference all Hartals, picketing and Civil Disobedience should cease.

Resolution No. 4

This Conference is likewise of opinion that having regard to the critical situation in the country and the desirability of effecting early settlement, a Round Table Conference should be called as soon as possible and His Majesty's Government should clothe the Viceroy with authority necessary for the purpose of arriving at a settlement.

Resolution No. 5

Without at present going into particulars of demands of the country with reference to the Punjab, Khilafat and Swaraj questions, this Conference hereby appoints a Committee of the following persons to carry on all communications with the Government on the one hand and important political organizations in the country on the other, with the view of arranging composition, dates and other details relating to holding of a Round Table Conference and for all purposes incidental to carrying out these Resolutions, including, when necessary, the convening of another representative Conference. The Committee consists of 20 men, including Visvesvaraya, Malaviya, P.C. Roy, Dinshaw Petit, Jayakar, Natarajan, Hasan Imam, Bhurgri and Gour.

On 27th January, 1922, the following cable was sent to the Private Secretary to the Viceroy:

In continuation of our letter sixteenth confirming telegram of same date transmitting the text of resolutions passed at Representative Conference held in Bombay on 14th and 15th January, we beg to submit, for His Excellency's information, following observations composition and proceedings of Conference, which may be helpful in appreciating real significance of work done at Conference. The Conference was called at very short notice in view of its urgency and invitations were sent to 350 persons of note in Indian politics, including several members of Indian and Provincial Legislatures. Number of those who attended the Conference

was more than 300. Different communities Hindu, Mohammedan, Parsi, Christian, and Anglo-Indian were represented. This fact contributed to weight of debate. Letters and messages were received from several others sympathising with object of Conference and wishing it success. As illustrating the care with which the invitations were issued, it might be mentioned that many persons who wished to be present were not admitted to the Conference, because the object of the conveners was not to hold a political demonstration but to take counsel with the leaders and workers of all parties on burning questions of the hour. Votes were called for only as a means of indicating general trend of opinion among members, on several resolutions considered by Conference and not for measuring exact strength of numbers supporting each of them. At request of conveners, Sir Sankaran Nair kindly came down from Indore to guide proceedings of Conference as Speaker. He presided at public session of Conference on the 14th and throughout Committee stage on the 15th. Before Conference resumed its session, however, he, for reasons into which it is needless to go here, relinquished the Chair.

Thereafter Conference resumed session with Sir Visvesvaraya as Speaker. Representatives of non-co-operation movement and leader Mr. Gandhi were present throughout proceedings. Mr. Gandhi also attended, by invitation, meeting of Committee appointed to consider resolutions. Non-co-operators and particularly Mr. Gandhi took part in dis-

cussions but abstained, in consequence of his creed, from voting on resolutions.

In speech on December, 21, last which Viceroy addressed to Calcutta deputation, His Excellency observed that he had no assurance from leaders who were responsible for non-co-operation activities, that those activities would cease, if Conference were convened. "I deeply regret" said His Excellency "that those are not the present conditions, and discussion which I thought was to have proceeded, on high level of patriotic desire by temporary, mutual concession and forbearance, to the finding of solution of India's present problems, takes form, in its present aspect of request to Government to abandon action which had led, or, as we believe, forced Government to take such action, would also cease."

In view of these requirements, the Bombay Conference passed Resolution 3, which has been given final shape in Committee after discussion with Mr. Gandhi. In accordance with understanding arrived at with him at the Conference, Working Committee of Congress subsequently passed separate resolution to similar effect. Working Committee has decided that simultaneously with performance of certain acts by Governments concerned, and in the event of Round Table Conference being called and pending such Conference, all hartals, picketing, and Civil Disobedience should cease. Conference in formulating resolution endeavoured, as far as possible, to secure substantial compliance with conditions defined by His Excellency in Cal-

cutta speech. Committee apprehend actual working of resolution framed, under pressure of time, may not adequately convey extent to which endeavour has succeeded in securing atmosphere of conciliation. Committee hopes, that on Government side, terms would be regarded as sufficient. Committee is convinced that there is earnest desire on part of all sections of public to find real solution of the problems facing country and that Conference resolutions constitute distinct advance towards fulfilment of that object.

We venture to submit that Conference has effected real improvement in political situation. So far as they have gone, pourparlers have in Committee's opinion advanced quite as satisfactorily as may be reasonably expected, having regard to exceptional circumstances of present times. Further development of negotiations can only be undertaken with advantage, not by correspondence or open Conference, but by informal and confidential consultations. That was the reason why in telegram to His Excellency, Committee suggested deputation of three of its members to wait on His Excellency at Delhi. Committee believes that with mutual sympathy and good-will, it will not be difficult to adjust needs of situation, by confidential Conferences and conversation till preliminaries are arranged to satisfaction of all parties. Mr. Gandhi and Working Committee of Congress have undertaken to postpone Civil Disobedience till 31st January, with express object of facilitating conduct of negotiations.

Under ordinary conditions many flaws may be detected in understanding reached so far, and many reasons found to stave off action, but we are persuaded that His Excellency will approach question, to use his own words, in a large and generous spirit and that no advantage or triumph would be claimed on either side and no reproach should be made by anyone either of having been forced to yield or of not having courage to proceed with campaign.

Public are anxious to see the country started on career of permanent progress by development of natural resources and increasing utilisation signs. The Reforms have not, as was at one time fondly hoped, ushered in new era in this respect. Need of immediate and large constitutional expansion is felt on all hands. Trade and industry are disorganized. Public mind is greatly agitated and dissatisfaction is entering new and acute phase. So long as large numbers of trusted leaders and citizens are confined in prisons, it is useless to expect peace, and delay in dealing with situation may increase unrest and accelerate crisis.

Request for Round Table Conference was first put forward by Calcutta deputation. Bombay Conference representing many shades of opinion, has now endorsed. Non-co-operators are not opposed to it, and Mr. Gandhi, their leader, is willing to attend Conference in individual capacity, without any terms. All parties in country are thus agreed as to necessity of Round Table Conference. His Excellency the Viceroy has expressed himself

in its favour and Committee considers that great advance has already been made towards fulfilment of preliminary conditions which His Excellency considered were essential. It now rests with His Excellency to give indication of the attitude he is prepared to take with reference to suggestion made in this letter and to claim from public all further co-operation necessary to realise common object.

Jinnah/Jayakar/Natarajan
Secretaries (Malabar Hill)

The Private Secretary to the Viceroy replied as follows:

In continuation of my telegrams of 18th and 19th instant, I am directed by His Excellency the Viceroy to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of the 16th January communicating the terms of the Resolutions passed by the representative Conference held at Bombay.

In reply I am directed to say that His Excellency regrets that the proposals now put forward should have been regarded by those who subscribe to the Resolution as a response to the sentiments which the Viceroy exprsesed at Calcutta. His Excellency has considered these proposals but is unable to discover in them the basis for profitable discussion on the subject of a Round Table Conference. No useful purpose would therefore be served by entering into any detailed examination of their terms.

Thereupon the Committee sent the following telegram on 30th January to the private Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy:

Your letter of 26th January received today. Our letter wired to you on the 27th (December) gives our reasons for regarding proposals put forward as substantial response to sentiments expressed by His Excellency at Calcutta. Committee are anxious to know why His Excellency is unable to discover in them basis for profitable discussion on the subject of Round Table Conference. Committee will be grateful to know which terms of Conference proposals are not acceptable, because Committee in that case will endeavour to meet His Excellency's wishes. Committee strongly feel present conditions most favourable for discussion and settlement in view of seriousness of situation, venture to request His Excellency to re-consider the matter.

Jinnah
Jayakar
Natarajan

On the same day i.e. 30th January, the Committee sent to Mr. Gandhi the following letter:

We are sending you herewith for your private information a copy of a reply received today from His Excellency the Viceroy and also copy of our letter sent to him by wire, asking for a re-consideration of the matter. The Committee is of opinion that these communications should not be pub-

lished just at present. The Committee request you, pending further communication probably in about three days' time, kindly to postpone your programme at Bardoli.

On the 1st February, 1922, Mr. Gandhi sent his so-called ultimatum to the Viceroy, copy whereof was forwarded by him to Mr. Jayakar. The Committee on 2nd February, 1922, sent the following letter to Mr. Gandhi:

Dear Mahatmaji,

The Committee are in receipt of your letter of Tuesday night, addressed to Mr. Jayakar, one of the signatories, and the copy of your letter to the Viceroy. They regret that you should have thought it advisable to send this letter to the Viceroy, while you were aware, from the copies of the letter from the Private Secretary to the Viceroy and the Committee's reply thereto, sent to you, that correspondence was still going on on the subject of the Round Table Conference. The Committee cannot agree that your letter either meets their requirements or is unexceptionable as you say in your letter.

Yours sincerely

M.A. Jinnah
M.R. Jayakar
K. Natarajan

On 6th February, 1922, the Government issued a communique relating to the Conference proposals. It, inter alia, said:

It remains for the Government of India to deal with the allegation that His Excellency summarily rejected the proposal for a conference, although the terms put forward by the Congress were quite in keeping with His Excellency's own requirements, as indicated in his speech at Calcutta. How far this is from being the case will be manifest from a comparison of His Excellency's speech with the terms proposed by the Conference. His Excellency in that speech insisted on the imperative necessity of a fundamental condition precedent to the discussion of any question of a conference of the discontinunance of unlawful activities of the Non-co--operation Party. No assurance on this point was, however, contained in the proposals advanced by the Conference. On the contrary, while the Government were asked to make concessions, which not only included the withdrawal of the notifications under the Criminal Law Amendment and Seditious Acts and the release of persons convicted of offences designed to affect the loyalty of the armed forces and the submission to an arbitration Committee of the cases of other persons convicted under ordinary law of the land, there was no suggestion that any of the illegal activities of the Non-co-operators other than hartals, picketing and civil disobedience would cease. Moreover, it was evident from the statements made by Mr. Gandhi at the Conference that he intended to continue the enrolment of volunteers in prohibited associations and preparations for civil disobedience. Further, Mr. Gandhi also made it apparent that the proposal of Round Table Conference should be called merely to register his decrees. It is idle to suggest that

terms of this character fulfil in any way the essentials laid down by His Excellency or can reasonably be described as having been made in response to the sentiments expressed by him.

The Conference Committee in a statement observed as follows :-

No assurance on this point (discontinuance of the unlawful activities of the non-co-operation party) was, however, contained in the proposals advanced by the Conference. In the very next sentence, however, it was admitted that there was the assurance that hartals, picketing and civil disobedience would cease. These have all along been considered as the principal offensive activities of the non-co-operationist and the fact that the resolution of the Conference provided for their cessation does not bear but the Government's statement that no assurance on this point was contained in the proposals of the conference.

The only other activities specified in the communique, to which exception has been taken, is the enrolment of volunteers in prohibited associations and preparation for civil disobedience. It was part of the proposal of the Conference that the notification prohibiting these associations should be withdrawn and when this was done, enrolment of volunteers for them could no longer be illegal. If, after that, they were engaged in any unlawful activity by way of preparation for civil disobedience or otherwise, they would be liable for their actions under the ordinary law.

It will thus be seen that, in respect of all the important offensive activities of the Non-co-operators, the Conference had secured the promise of cessation simultaneously with the reversal of the repressive policy of the Government.

Then it is said that Mr. Gandhi made it apparent that the proposed Round Table Conference would be merely to register his decrees. The Conference obviously cannot be held responsible for anything outside its resolutions. But as to this inference from the appearance of what Mr. Gandhi said or did at the Conference, it is relevant to cite the following from a note to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, in which Mr. Gandhi has explained his real meaning. It was read by Mr. Seshagiri Iyer in his speech at the Legislative Assembly: "What I mean is that until I am convinced that my demands are unreasonable, unjust or impossible of fulfilment, I would not recede from them. I would not consider the unwillingness of the Government or Parliament to grant any of these things to be a ground for reducing the demands. The value of a Round Table Conference consists in understanding each other's difficulties and of making allowances for them. Hence my insisting that Government must change their heart. If they entrench themselves behind their armed forces, the Conference would be not only fruitless but mischievous. They must try to appeal to our intellect, just as we must appeal to theirs. If the Government or anybody, therefore, shows that any particular demand is

unreasonable or untenable I would certainly give it up as I did yesterday on the question of the motion of securing the release of political prisoners other than the two classes mentioned in Resolution No. 3 of the Conference.

It may be added that though, Mr. Gandhi in the speech at the Conference said volunteering would continue, he qualified it by saying that "the preparation will not be of an offensive character nor of a hostile character." He explained this further in an article in "Young India."

The Committee cannot help thinking these and other points might most suitably have been communicated to them in response to their request of the 30th of January in reply to the letter from the Viceroy's Private Secretary. The Committee regrets the omission of Government to do so in a direct manner, because its task of endeavouring to secure a peaceful atmosphere in which to consider the questions arising out of the present situation, has been thereby rendered more difficult than it would otherwise have been.

On 7th February 1922, the following letter was addressed by the Private Secretary to H.E. the Viceroy to the Hon. Secretaries. (It is interesting to mention that the letter never reached the Committee but was returned by the Post Office authorities as undelivered.)

From

The Private Secretary to H.E. the Viceroy

To

The Honorary Secretaries, Representative Conference, Bombay.

Sirs,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of the 30th of January (then it quotes the contents of the telegram already stated above).

In reply, I am desired to refer you to the communique of the Government of India of the 6th of February, (already quoted above). For reasons explained therein, His Excellency is of opinion that the proposals of your Conference, which are substantially with those of the Working Committee of the Congress, in no way fulfil the essentials laid down by His Excellency in his speech at Calcutta and he must adhere to the view that they cannot reasonably be described as having been made in response to the sentiments then expressed by him. His Excellency appreciates the statement that your Committee will endeavour to meet his wishes in regard to any terms which are not regarded as

acceptable, but, in view of the attitude taken up by Mr. Gandhi, in his manifesto of the 4th of February (ultimatum), His Excellency considers that any further discussion in present conditions of a Round Table Conference would serve no purpose.

On 24th February 1922, the following letter was addressed by the Private Secretary to Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah:

My Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The enclosed letter, viz., the one of the 7th of February, 1922 (just quoted above) addressed to the Hony. Secretaries of the Representative Conference at Bombay and despatched on the 7th of February, has just been returned to me by the Post Office authorities as undelivered.

It is very regrettable that this letter failed to reach you or one of the other Secretaries, who signed the letter to which it is a reply. I hope that you will explain the facts to the persons concerned.

Yours sincerely,

Private Secretary to Viceroy

SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE

Correspondence between Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, the then President of the Congress and Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League.

Copy of the note handed over by Mr. Bose to Mr. Jinnah:

In the course of the talks between the Congress President and Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, Mr. Jinnah suggested that any agreement that might be arrived at should be based on a clear understanding of the position of the Congress and that of the Muslim League. He proposed that the conversation should proceed on the following basis :—

"The All-India Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Indian Muslims, and the Congress as the authoritative and representative organisation of the solid body of Hindu opinion, have hereby agreed to the following terms by way of a pact between the two major communities and as a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question."

After further consideration a somewhat different wording was suggested by him as follows:—

"The Congress and the All-India Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisations of the Mussalmans of India have hereby agreed to the following terms a of Hindus-Muslim settlement by way of a pact."

The second statement, though shorter, apparently embodies the same idea which is given in the first, that is, that the Congress should represent the Hindus and the Muslim League the Mussalmans.

The Congress cannot possibly consider itself or function as if it represented one community only, even though that might be the majority community in India. Its doors must inevitably be open to all communities and it must welcome all Indians who agree with its general policy and methods. It cannot accept the position of representing one community and thus itself becoming a communal organisation. At the same time the Congress is perfectly willing to confer and co-operate with other organisations which represent minority interests.

It is obvious that the Mussalmans of India, though a minority in the whole country, form a very considerable part of the population and their wishes and desires must be considered in any scheme affecting India. It is also true that the All-India Muslim League is an organisation representing a large body of muslim opinion which must carry weight. It is for this reason that the Congress has endeavoured to understand the view-point of the

League and to come to an understanding with it. The congress, however, would be bound to consult other existing muslim organisations which have co-operated with the Congress in the past. Further in the event of other group or minority interests being involved it will be necessary to consult representatives of such interests.

Letter from Mr. Bose to Mr. Jinnah.

Dated Bombay, May 15, 1938.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Last night I gave you a note explaining our position. You asked me what constructive proposals we had to make. I think the note is self-explanatory. Having made known the Congress reaction to your suggestion, according to us, it remains now to proceed to the next stage namely appointment of respective committees which will jointly settle the terms of understanding.

Yours sincerely,

Subhas C. Bose.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Bose.

Dated Bombay, 16 May, 1938.

Dear Mr. Bose,

I acknowledge the receipt of a note you handed over to me on behalf of the Congress on the 14th,

and also I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 15th of May, 1938. The matter will be placed before the Executive and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League at a meeting to be called in the first week of June, and I will communicate to you the decision as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Mr. M.A. Jinnah to Mr. S. Bose.

Dated, Bombay, June, 5. 1938.

Dear Mr. Bose,

I am enclosing herewith unanimous opinion of the Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League as promised by me in my letter dated the 16th of May with reference to the note given to me by you on behalf of the Congress and your letter of the 15th of May 1938.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

RESOLUTION NO. 1.—

The Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League has considered the note handed over by the President Mr. S. Bose on behalf of the Congress to Mr. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim

League, on the 14th May, and his letter of the 15th May, 1938, and find that it is possible for the All-India Muslim League to treat or negotiate with the Congress the question of Hindu-Muslim settlement except on the basis that the Muslim League is the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India.

RESOLUTION NO. 2.—

The Council have also considered the letter of Mr. Gandhi, dated the 22nd May, 1938, and are of opinion that it is not desirable to include any Muslim in the personnel of the proposed committee that may be appointed by the Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 3.—

The Executive Council wish to make it clear that it is the declared policy of the All-India Muslim League, that all other minorities should have their rights and interest safeguarded so as to create a sense of security amongst them, and win their confidence, and the All-India Muslim League will consult the representatives of such minorities, and any other interest as may be involved, when necessary.

Letter from Subhas Chandra Bose to Mr. M.A. Jinnah.

Dated Wardha, July 25, 1938.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The Working Committee has given all the attention it was possible for it to give to the resolu-

tions of the Muslim League you were good enough to enclose with your letter of the 5th. June, 1938. The first resolution of the League Council defines the status of the League. If it means that before we proceed to set up a machinery for considering the terms of settlement of the communal question, the Congress should recognise the status as defined in that resolution, there is an obvious difficulty. Though, the resolution does not use the adjective, 'only', the language of the resolution means that the adjective is understood. Already the Working Committee has received warnings against recognising the exclusive status of the League. There are Muslim organisations which have been functioning independently of the Muslim League. Some of them are staunch supporters of the Congress. Moreover, there are individual Muslims who are Congressmen, some of whom exercise no inconsiderable influence in the country. Then there is the Frontier Province which is overwhelmingly Muslim and which is solidly with the Congress. You will see that in the face of these known facts it is not only impossible, but improper for the Congress to make the admission which the first resolution of the League Council apparently desires the Congress to make. It is suggested that the status of organisations does not accrue to them by any defining of it. It comes through the service to which a particular organisation has dedicated itself. The Working Committee therefore hopes, that the League Council will not ask the Congress to do the impossible. It is not enough that the Congress is not only willing but eager to establish the friendliest relations

with the League and to come to an honourable understanding over the much vexed Hindu-Muslim question?

At this stage it may perhaps be as well to state the Congress claim. Though it is admitted that the largest number of persons to be found on the numerous Congress registers are Hindus, the Congress has a fairly large number of Muslims and members of other communities professing different faiths. It has been an unbroken tradition with the Congress to represent all communities, all races and all classes to whom India is their home. From its inception it has often had distinguished Muslims as Presidents and as General Secretaries who enjoyed the confidence of the Congress and of the country. The Congress tradition is that though a Congressman does not cease to belong to the Faith in which he is born and bred up, no one comes to the Congress by virtue of his faith; he is in and of the Congress by virtue of his endorsement of the political principles and policy of the Congress. The Congress, therefore, is in no sense a communal organisation. In fact it has always fought the communal spirit, because it is detrimental to the growth of pure and undefiled nationalism. But whilst the Congress makes this claim, and has sought, with more or less success, to live up to the claim, the Working Committee asks for no recognition from the League Council. The Committee would be glad if your Council would come to an understanding with the Congress in order that we might achieve national soli-

darity and wholeheartedly work for realising our common destiny.,

As to the second resolution of the Council, I am afraid that it is not possible for the Working Committee to conform to the desire expressed therein.

The third resolution, the Working Committee is unable to understand. So far as the Working Committee is aware, the Muslim League is purely a communal organisation, in the sense that it seeks to serve Muslim interests and its membership too is open only to Muslims. The Working Committee also has all along understood that so far as the League is concerned, it desires, and rightly, a settlement with the Congress on the Hindu-Muslim question and not on questions affecting all minorities. So far as the Congress is concerned, if the other minorities have a grievance against the Congress, it is always ready to deal with them as it is its bounden duty to do, being its very constitution and organisation representative of all India without distinction of caste or creed.

In view of the foregoing I hope that it will be possible for us to take up the next stage in our negotiations for reaching settlement.

It is suggested that as the previous correspondence has already been published, it would be wise to take the public into confidence and publish the subsequent correspondence between us. If you are

agreeable these documents will be immediately released for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Subhas C. Bose.

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Mr. S. Bose.

Dated August, 2nd, 1938.

Dear Mr. Bose,

I placed your letter dated the 25th of July, 1938, before the meeting of the Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League.

The Executive Council gave its earnest attention and careful consideration to the arguments which were urged in your letter for persuading it not to claim the status it has done in its resolution No. 1, already communicated to you. I am desired to state that in defining the status the Council was not actuated by any motive of securing an admission, but had merely stated an accepted fact.

The Council is fully convinced that the Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative political organisation of the Mussalmans of India. This position was accepted when the Congress-League Pact was arrived at in 1916, at Lucknow, and ever since, till 1935, when Jinnah-Rajendra Prashad conversation took place, it has not been questioned.

The All-India Muslim League, therefore, does not require any admission or recognition from the Congress and nor did the resolution of the Executive Council passed at Bombay. But in view of the fact that the position—in fact the very existence—of the League had been questioned by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, the President of the Congress, in one of his statements, wherein he asserted that there were only two parties in the country, viz. the British Government and the Congress, it was considered necessary by the Executive Council to inform the Congress of the basis on which the negotiations between the two organisations could proceed.

Besides, the very fact that the Congress approached the Muslim League to enter into negotiations for a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question it presupposed the authoritative and representative character of the League, and as such, its right to come to an agreement, on behalf of the Mussalmans of India.

The Council are aware of the fact that there is a Congress coalition government in N.W.F.P. and also that there are some Muslims in the Congress organistion in other provinces. But the Council is of opinion that these Muslims in the Congress do not, and cannot represent the Mussalmans of India, for the simple reason that their number is very insignificant, and that as members of the Congress they have disabled themselves from representing, or speaking on behalf of the Muslim community. Were it not so, the whole claim of the Congress, alleged in

your letter, regarding its national character, would fall to the ground.

As regards, "the other Muslim organisations", to which reference has been made in your letter, but whom you have not even named, the Council considers that it would have been more proper if no reference had been made to them. If they collectively, or individually, had been in a position to speak on behalf of the Mussalmans of India, the negotiations with the Muslim League, for a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, would not have been initiated by the President of the Congress, and Mr. Gandhi. However, so far as the Muslim League is concerned, it is not aware that any Muslim political organisation has ever made a claim that it can speak or negotiate on behalf of the Muslims of India. It is, therefore, very much to be regretted, that you should have referred to "other Muslims Organisations" in this connection.

The Council is equally anxious to bring about a sttlement of "the much vexed Hindu-Muslim question", and this hastens the realization of the common goal, but it is painful to find that subtle arguments are being introduced to cloud the issue and retard the progress of the negotiations.

In view of the facts stated above, the Council still hopes, that the representative character of the Muslim League will not be questioned, and that the Congress will proceed to appoint a committee on that basis.

With reference to the second resolution, the Council wishes to point out that it considered undesirable the inclusion of Mussalmans in the Committee that might be appointed by the Congress, because it would meet to solve and settle the Hindu-Muslim question, and so in the very nature of the issues involved they would not command the confidence of either Hindus or the Mussalmans, and their position indeed would be most embarrassing. The Council, therefore, request you to consider the question in the light of the above observations.

With reference to the third resolution, it was the memoradum of the Congress, referred to in your letter, dated, the 15th of May, 1938, in which mention of other minorities was made, and the Muslim League expressed its willingness to consult them, if, and when it was necessary in consonance with its declared polity.

As regards your desire for the release of the correspondence, including this letter, for publication, the Council has no objection to your doing so.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose to Mr. Jinnah.

Dated Calcutta, 2nd October 1938.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Your letter of the 2nd August, 1938, has been placed before the Working Committee. After due

deliberation it has resolved to reply as follows :—

"Though there are inaccuracies in your letter, no purpose will be served by dwelling on them. The substance of your letter seems to be, that the League does not expect the Congress, whether implicitly or explicitly, to acknowledge its status as the authoritative Muslim organisation of India. If this view is accepted by the League, I am authorised to state, that the Working Committee will confer with the Committee, that may be appointed by the League, to draw up the terms of settlement.

"The Working Committee will be represented by at least five of its members at the sittings of the Conference."

"As the previous correspondence has already been released for publication, I am taking the liberty of issuing this to the Press."

Yours sincerely,

S. Bose.

Letter from Mr. M.A. Jinnah to Mr. Bose.

Little Gibbs Road, Malabar Hill.
Dated Bombay, October 10, 1938.

Dear Mr. Bose,

I am in receipt of your letter dated the 2nd of October, which was placed before the Executive

Council. I am authorised to state in reply as follows:—

The Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League regret very much that the Working Committee of the Congress should have entirely misread my letter dated the 2nd of August, 1938, which is quite clear, and does not require any elucidation or further interpretation. The Muslim League are still ready to proceed with the negotiations for settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, on the basis defined by my letter referred to above, and would appoint its representatives to meet the Committee, that may be appointed by the Congress, on the footing indicated by us in our three resolutions of the 5th of June, 1938, already communicated to you.

As all the correspondence so far in this connection has been published, I am issuing this to the Press.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * * * *

NAWAB AHMED SAID CHATTARI

Letter from Nawab of Chattari to Mr. Jinnah.

Dated 20th July, 1941.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

As I have accepted a salaried appointment in an Indian State, I write this to tender my resignation from the membership of the Council of the All-India Muslim League. It is needless for me to say that your good wishes and blessings would always be a source of great strength to me, and I am sure that they would not be denied.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Ahmed Said.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Nawab of Chattari,

Dated, July 30, 1941.

Dear Nawab Sahib,

I received your letter dated, July the 20th from Chattari in the afternoon of the 24th

of July, 1941. On examining the envelope I find that it was posted and registered at Delhi on the 22nd of July.

I beg to inform you that it was decided before the receipt of your letter to take disciplinary action against you, as indicated by my statement issued on the 21st, as you were a member of the Muslim League, for having joined the so-called National Defence Council. I regret, therefore, that apart from the technicality that your letter should have been addressed to the Secretary, I am unable to accept your resignation, pending the result of the disciplinary action that has to be taken against you. However, I am forwarding your letter to the Secretary of the All-India Muslim League.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * * * *

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay.

28th March, 1919

To,

Lord Chelmsford,
Viceroy.

Your Excellency,

"The passing of the Rowlat Bill by the Government of India, and the assent given to it by Your Excellency as Governor-General against the will of the people, has severely shaken the trust reposed by them in British justice. Further, it has clearly demonstrated the constitution of the Imperial Legislative Council, which is a legislature but in name—a machine propelled by a foreign executive. Neither the unanimous members nor the entire public opinion and feeling outside has met with the least respect.

The Government of India and Your Excellency, however, have thought it fit to place on the Statute Book a measure admittedly obnoxious and decidedly coercive at a time of peace, thereby substituting the executive for the judicial.

Besides, by passing this Bill, Your Excellency's Government have actively negatived every argument they advanced, but a year ago when they

appealed to India for help at the War Conference, and have ruthlessly trampled upon the principles for which Great Britain avowedly fought the war.

The fundamental principles of justice have been uprooted, and the constitutional rights of the people have been violated at a time when there is no real danger to the State by an overfretful and incompetent bureaucracy, which is neither responsible to the people nor in touch with real public opinion, and their sole plea is that the powers when they are assumed will not be abused.

I, therefore, as a protest against the passing of the Bill and the manner in which it was passed, tender my resignation as a member of the Imperial Legislative Council, for I feel that under the prevailing conditions I can be of no use to my people in the Council, nor consistently with one's self-respect co-operation is possible with a Government that shows such utter disregard for the opinion of the representatives of the people in the Council Chamber, and for the feelings and sentiments of the people outside.

In my opinion, a Government that passes or sanctions such a law in times of peace forfeits its claim to be called a civilised Government and I still hope that the Secretary of State for India, Mr. Montague, will advise His Majesty to signify his disallowance to this Black Act.

Yours truly,

M.A. Jinnah

FAZLUL HUQUE

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

8th December, 1940.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

You must have read in the papers my statements on the necessity of a final attempt to solve the communal problem of India. I do not wish to do anything without your consent and I am, therefore, writing these few lines to request you to call a meeting of the Working Committee or of the Council of the All-India Muslim League as early as possible. In all my statements, I have said nothing beyond the fact that the League might call the conference. Some day or the other, these communal differences will be made up, but I do not see any reason why the Muslim League should not take the wind out of the sails of other organisations and secure to itself the credit of having done the greatest possible service to India and her people. Let us discuss, and if we fail, the blame will not be ours. As regards the subjects to be discussed, I will send you my note later on.

Yours sincerely,

Fazlul Huque.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Fazlul Haque,
11th December, 1940

Apart from the wisdom of this move on your part, I regret to say that you should have adopted this course without reference to me. From your statement, it follows that you are forcing the Muslim League that they should take the initiative, because in your second statement you are definitely appealing to the members of the Council of the All-India Muslim League to support you, and state that they should call upon me to summon an emergency meeting of the Council or the Working Committee of the League. This, whatever may have been your intentions, clearly conveys that I am not willing to come to a settlement for this unfortunate deadlock, for which the Congress alone is responsible.

I know you are very busy as the head of the Bengal Government. Perhaps, you have not followed what has taken place at the various stages of negotiations upto the present moment. I would, therefore, request you to read carefully at least the resolutions of the Working Committee, and the Council of the All-India Muslim League, and my recent speech in the Central Assembly in connection with the supplementary Finance Bill. This speech of mine is fully reported in many newspapers.

You have already in the public press declared your opinion as if the Muslim League was to be goaded by somebody to come to a settlement and decided that we should consider the proposals

which you are going to formulate for the purpose. I am glad that you are going to send me those proposals and I am awaiting them before I can express any further opinion on the matter with regard to calling the meeting of the Working Committee or the Council. As suggested to you apart from the wisdom of your having issued these statements, and having appealed to the members of the Council in the Press, I think your move will convey the impression in the political quarters in India and in England that the Mussalmans are divided, as it has already been so interpreted in many quarters.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

14th December, 1940.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I am very sorry that owing to prevailing facts and circumstances my move has already been misunderstood. I made it clear in my statements that I did not wish to dictate to you anything, but only to express the desire that there should be an effort for peace. In doing so, I never meant to insinuate that any one was to blame, although I did perfectly know where the offence really lies. But, it would not be politic for me to say anything indicating that I am already a party-man. At the same time, I feel so strongly that there should be one more peace effort and for that reason I could not resist the tem-

ptation of making a suggestion. I never meant that I should take the lead or I should dictate but I was really asking you to take the lead and as the head of the premier political organisation of India, to call everybody else to meet you in order that they may be able to put their case before you and you may be in a position to discuss problems with them across the table and come to a decision. My object really was to put you in the position of the dictator of India. I am sorry if I have been misunderstood by you and my other friends. If you still think that my move has in any way been unwise, you can tell me accordingly. It is far from my intention to bring about a disruption in the Muslim League. I hope you will write to me both freely and frankly so that I may be able to repair any wrong that I may have unwittingly inflicted on the reputation of the League.

My only desire has been for peace, because I feel that unless there is unity among all communities on the principle of give and take, there will be no constitutional advance and no prospect of a better India than we know at the present moment.

The present Government of India Act is absolutely rubbish. It gives us responsibility but no power. It gives all the power to the Governor and the Governor-General-in-Council but all the responsibilities to the Ministers.

You can therefore, easily understand how much we feel our position under the present constitution

and how much we are longing for a better state of things. I feel that the only obstacle in the way is the present impasse. I, therefore, think that this should be removed anyhow, but not by any surrender of our principles or of the position that we now hold. That will be for you to decide, but do please try to bring about a solution which will enable India to march forward. If you think that it is the Pakistan scheme and nothing else why not send for these people and explain to them what you mean? People are not able to appreciate or understand the thing fully. This will be removed if you have free talks with the leaders. It is not for me to suggest ways and means but I have indicated to you my heart's desire, and I hope you will appreciate it.

Yours sincerely,

Fazlul Huque.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Fazlul Huque.

4th January, 1941.

Dear Mr. Fazlul Huque,

I really do not know what I can say with regard to this matter. I think you have seen what the Press has been writing about this move. You have recently issued a statement from Poona saying that you are misunderstood. Well, I cannot blame the people because I said from the very beginning that it was a very unwise move. I am quite sure that you did not intend to bring about a disruption in Muslim League. I quite appreciate your desire

for peace and settlement and nobody desires them more than I do. But, the question is how they should be brought about. When the other party has declared a war and is holding a pistol at your head, what do you propose that I should do? What do you think is the aim and the object of the Congress in launching civil disobedience? Is it not obvious that they want to bend the British Government to surrender or yield to their demands? At whose cost? Over our head and at our cost.

An old and experienced politician like you and a veteran fighter that you are, what do you expect me to do in these circumstances?

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Mr. Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

7th January, 1941.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have received your letter. I quite understand your view-point, but certainly something will have to be done. However, I am doing nothing at the present moment and I am allowing things to simmer. As a matter of fact, I am watching developments. If there is anything particular, I shall let you know.

Yours sincerely,

Fazlul Huque.

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Fazlul Huque, dated 21st January 1941.

My attention drawn to a summary press report of our correspondence regarding your move Hindu-Muslim settlement. Report incorrectly represented. Its source am informed Calcutta. Propose release complete correspondence.

Telegram from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah dated 22nd January, 1941.

Surprised your telegram. I know absolutely nothing. Will you kindly await my letter, just writing?

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have already sent you a wire yesterday about incorrect reports in the Press regarding our Hindu-Muslim unity move. As I have already wired to you, I know nothing about these mis-statements in the Press nor have I yet seen them. You say that they emanated from Calcutta. I made enquiries but I cannot lay my hand on any one who may be guilty. I can have no objection to your publishing the whole correspondence, but I would ask you to consider if that will not worsen matters. It would be much better if you made a fresh statement pointing out the inaccuracies and stating what the real facts are. I feel more and more convinced that this unity move is bound to be a fiasco as Communities do not

show the slightest inclination to be friendly. In these circumstances, no useful purpose will be served by our publication of the correspondence that passed between us at a time when I was full of hope. I am still anxious to work for a compromise when the parties are unaccommodating other. Hope you will consider my point of view before you decide anything.

Yours sincerely,

Fazlul Huque.

(1942-43)

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

New Delhi.

November 13, 1942.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

You have known me for over 30 years and you can easily realise, I have been longing to meet you and to assure you my attachment to you and the Muslim Lague.

It is an irony of fate that this rift should have taken place between you and me after close cooperation for the long span of over quarter of a century. However, I request you to allow the dead-past bury its dead and throw a veil over all

that has happened during the past few months, and remove the ban on me and my supporters and facilitate our entry in the League fold. I can assure you that I will abide by the discipline of the party and the instructions of the President of the Muslim League.

As for the Progressive Muslim League, up to now it exists on paper only and it ceases to exist automatically with my entry and the entry of my supporters into the League.

I need hardly emphasise the fact that in the interests of Islam and the Muslim solidarity I am prepared to make any sacrifices and to subordinate my personal interests and inclinations to the supreme demand of Muslim Nation. I am extremely anxious that the breach in the Muslim community should be made up, and efforts should be made that no Muslim may remain outside the folds of the League.

I understand you will be leaving Delhi tonight, but I would appreciate it very much if you would give me a few minutes' time to talk to you personally and to explain everything frankly.

Under Providence I leave the interest of Bengal Muslims in your hands.

Yours sincerely,

A. K. Fazlul Haque.

show the slightest inclination to be friendly. In these circumstances, no useful purpose will be served by our publication of the correspondence that passed between us at a time when I was full of hope. I am still anxious to work for a compromise when the parties are unaccommodating other. Hope you will consider my point of view before you decide anything.

Yours sincerely,

Fazlul Huque.

(1942-43)

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

New Delhi.

November 13, 1942.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

You have known me for over 30 years and you can easily realise, I have been longing to meet you and to assure you my attachment to you and the Muslim Lague.

It is an irony of fate that this rift should have taken place between you and me after close co-operation for the long span of over quarter of a century. However, I request you to allow the dead-past bury its dead and throw a veil over all

that has happened during the past few months, and remove the ban on me and my supporters and facilitate our entry in the League fold. I can assure you that I will abide by the discipline of the party and the instructions of the President of the Muslim League.

As for the Progressive Muslim League, up to now it exists on paper only and it ceases to exist automatically with my entry and the entry of my supporters into the League.

I need hardly emphasise the fact that in the interests of Islam and the Muslim solidarity I am prepared to make any sacrifices and to subordinate my personal interests and inclinations to the supreme demand of Muslim Nation. I am extremely anxious that the breach in the Muslim community should be made up, and efforts should be made that no Muslim may remain outside the folds of the League.

I understand you will be leaving Delhi tonight, but I would appreciate it very much if you would give me a few minutes' time to talk to you personally and to explain everything frankly.

Under Providence I leave the interest of Bengal Muslims in your hands.

Yours sincerely,

A. K. Fazlul Haque.

Letter from Mr. Fazlul Huque to Mr. Jinnah.

Dated February 5, 1943.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I am determined to solve the Bengal tangle and to put an end to the meaningless strife which is having the most undesirable consequences on the prospects of the Muslim community in Bengal.

Through the mercy of Providence I have an assured position in the Bengal Legislative Assembly, and can carry on for an indefinite period till the end of the war and one year after.

But I am going to sacrifice all, that I now possess, for the sake of my country and of the solidarity of my community.

The step that I am taking will also show that I have not been able to blame for the unfortunate events that have taken place in Bengal during the last 15 months and that I have been more sinned against than sinning. I do not, however, wish to rake up the unpleasant past, but to concentrate on the future.

I gathered from the last words you told me in the course of my last interview with you, that in case I liquidate the Progressive Party and resign from my office as Premier you would lift the ban which has been put on me.

I have thought carefully over the situation and with a view to facilitate my coming back to the League, I am ready to tender my resignation which will mean the automatic dissolution of the Progressive Coalition Party.

May I now get a line from you to tell me that I have understood you alright, and that the ban put on me will be lifted as soon as I tender resignation of my office as Premier? If so, I will take my step I have indicated, and I hope you will render the barest possible justice by taking me back to the League as soon as your conditions are satisfied.

If I come back to the League, it will be a matter of party politics in Bengal for Muslim members and Muslim leaders to determine as to who should be the chief and what should be the composition of the Bengal Cabinet?

So long as we do not contravene the rules and principles you have laid down, I hope, you will not impose your decision on the steps we may take in Bengal for securing the best possible administration in the country.

With deep regards,

I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. K. Fazlul Huque.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Fazlul Huqe.

Dated February 10, 1943.

Dear Mr. Huque,

I am in receipt of your letter of February 5. In the course of the interview that you had with me in consequence of your letter of November 13, 1942, I maintained that our decision was entirely due to your wrong conduct and action that you took and that you have already done a very great harm to the Muslim cause, of which you are better aware than anybody else.

I re-assured you that I have no personal feeling in the matter nor was I, or am I influenced by any outside agency or any particular individual.

I took the decision of expelling you from the Muslim League because your conduct and action was a gross breach of discipline and fundamental principles and policy of the All-India Muslim League organisation. Therefore, you expressed regret and assured me that you were repentant and also expressed your willingness to abide by whatever proposal I would consider fair.

You told me that all that you wanted was that the ban should be lifted and that you were ready and willing to remain as an ordinary member of the League and serve the organisation in any capacity that the League may assign to you.

In your letter of Nov. 13, 1942, also, before I gave you an interview you stated, "I can assure you that I will abide by the discipline of the party and the instructions of the President of the Muslim League."

Thereupon, I made the following suggestions to you subject to the final sanction of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League.

(1) "That you should express your regret for what you have done. If you have now come to the conclusion that you should be re-admitted as a member, it is due to the organisation from you, whose membership you value so much, that you should show repentance on your part. Otherwise if members were expelled and allowed to be re-admitted, as if nothing had happened, it would not only be inconsistent with self-respect of the organisation, but would be destructive of the elementary principles of discipline."

"The first point, therefore that I suggested in my last interview with you, was that you should express your regret for what you have done."

(2) "That you should liquidate the Progressive Coalition Party or completely dissociate yourself from it and resign from your office as Premier. After that, I told you, I was prepared to see that the ban should be lifted and that you and other Muslims, who were expelled, should be eligible for membership of the Muslim League and also to Muslim League Party in the Bengal Assembly. Thereafter,

the Muslim League party in the Bengal Assembly will take such decisions as may be necessary from time to time with regard to matters arising in connection with and relating to the Legislature and the administration of the Government of Bengal in consonance with the fundamental principles and the policy of the All-India Muslim League; subject, of course, to one over-riding provision which is embodied in the Resolution No. 2 of the Working Committee dated Oct. 22, 1939, and confirmed by Resolution No. 1 of the Council of the All-India Muslim League dated Feb. 25, 1940, which runs as follows :—

"The Working Committee hereby empower the President to advise, guide and issue instructions to Muslim League parties in the various Provincial Legislatures in the event of some sudden emergency arising.

"The Muslim League parties shall give effect to or carry out such instructions as may be given by the President."

At this interview of the 13th Nov. 1942, you agreed to carry out these conditions within a fortnight. But I heard nothing further from you till now.

Before I close I must say that I cannot appreciate the tone, the language and sentiments expressed by you in the first paragraph of your letter, because although you conclude it by saying "I do not, however, wish to rake up the unpleasant

past, but to concentrate on the future", you have already indulged to a considerable extent in raking up the past.

I must also repudiate and cannot agree with you what you say in this paragraph, as it is contrary to real facts. I am obliged to say this because if you really wanted to bury the unpleasant past and intended to concentrate on the future you should not have started with such a preamble as is contained in this paragraph of your letter.

Nor do I understand the last paragraph of your letter, specially when you say, "I hope you will not impose your decision on the steps that we take in Bengal for securing the best possible administration for all communities in the country." Perhaps it is a mistake and I suppose you mean Bengal.

Nor do I understand what is the meaning of your suggestion that I should not impose my decision on the steps that you may take in Bengal.

However, it seems to me that the last paragraph of your letter need not be discussed further, in view of what I have already explained and stated above, namely the conditions to be complied with, in order to facilitate your being re-admitted to the Muslim League organisation.

I shall move in the matter as soon as the above conditions are satisfied by you.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Jinnah—Gandhi Correspondence

Part—I
(1918)

(On July 4, 1918, Mr. Gandhi addressed the following letter to Mr. Jinnah, who was at that time President of the Home Rule League, Bombay Branch.)

I do wish you would make an emphatic declaration regarding recruitment. Can you not see that if every Home Rule Leaguer became a potent recruiting agency whilst at the same time fighting for constitutional rights we should ensure the passing of the Congress—League scheme, with only such modifications, if any, that we may agree to? We would then speak far more effectively than do today. 'Seek ye first the recruiting office and everything will be added unto you.' We must give the lead to the people and not think how the people will take what we say. What I ask for is an emphatic declaration, not a halting one.

Mr. Jinnah's reply is not traceable. It may be recalled that about the same time War Conference was held in Delhi whereas Mr. Jinnah had moved a resolution on constitutional reform for India. The resolution was, however, ruled out of order by the Chairman which caused great resentment among those present. Mr. Jinnah in his speech explained that war measures were in no way prejudiced by taking up of question of Constitutional reforms. Thereafter Bombay Provincial Conference

was held on 10th June, 1918. Addressing the Conference, the Governor, (Lord Willingdon) had said :

Eager and anxious as I am to feel assured of an entirely united force to assist me in this campaign, there are a certain number of gentlemen, some of whom have considerable influence with the public, many of them members of the political organisation called the Home Rule League whose activities have been such of late years, that I cannot honestly feel sure of the sincerity of their support, until I have come to a clear understanding with them and have frankly expressed to them all that is in my mind.

Mr. Jinnah in reply pointed out that the public response to the message of King-Emperor, namely, their assurance of the determination of the Presidency to continue to do her duty to her utmost capacity in the great crisis through which the Empire was passing, had the support of the entire educated community of India. There were also no two opinions at this crisis that India should go forward-nay, it was imperative that India should develop her man-power, and utilise her resources to the fullest possible extent. But before he would proceed further, he must say that he was pained, very much pained, that His Excellency should have thought fit to cast doubts on the sincerity and the loyalty of the Home Party. He was very sorry, but with the utmost respect he must enter his emphatic protest against that. They were anxious as any one else to help the defence of the motherland

and the Empire. He did not wish to take up the time of that august body at that late hour. The difference was only regarding the methods, for, Government's methods the Home Rule Party did not want, he was only making suggestions for the improvement of the scheme. The Government had their own scheme, namely, for the recruitment of sepoys, but that was not enough to save them from the German menace, which was right at their door on the frontiers. They wanted a national army or, in other words, a citizen army and not a purely mercenary army.

Continuing the speech, Jinnah pointed out that His Highness the Maharaja of Jamnagar had said that "we should not bargain, that we should not be moved by a huckstering spirit; we should wait for what we want today till tomorrow and if we do what we are required to do we shall surely get our desire." Mr. Manmohandas Ramji, on the other hand had said: "We should do all we can now and we shall get the benefit and what we want afterwards."

Mr. Jinnah: Now is this not bargaining? Mr. Manmohandas is a strict business man; our young men are not and our recruiting field is our young men. They prefer to be made to feel that they are the citizens of the Empire and that would rouse them to come forward and make sacrifices. I don't agree that we should do all we can on the understanding that we are going to be rewarded for it afterwards, neither do I say that we should bargain and make conditions before we help the Empire, but I say that if you wish to enable us to

help you, to facilitate and stimulate the recruiting, you must make the educated people feel that they are the citizens of the Empire and the King's equal subjects. But the Government do not do so. You say that we shall be trusted and made real partners in the Empire. When? We don't want words. We don't want the consideration of the matter indefinitely put off. We want action and immediate deeds. I will only give one instance of the dilatoriness. At the Delhi War Conference, we passed a resolution recommending that a substantial number of King's Commissions should be granted to the people of India and that the training colleges should be thrown open. It is nearly two months now. And what has been done? I have heard nothing yet. We would not succeed in preparing the real defence of India, much less help the Empire, unless India is made a partner of the Empire and trusted.

The Chairman said that the speaker had better go to the Government at Delhi or Simla and say those things there, for he had no power over that matter.

Mr. Jinnah: But Your Excellency said that the Bombay Government had been directed by the Government of India to carry out the proposals embodied in the memorandum annexed to the resolution now under discussion. If the Government wanted us to cooperate with them and carry out their wishes in this province then let them trust us. I cannot agree with the methods laid down in the resolution, and I do not approve of that part

of the resolution which deals with the appointment of boards.

The Chairman said Jinnah could not question the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Jinnah: I will say that I cannot support the whole of the resolution, but only a part of it. I do not approve of the personnel of the Board. I do not agree with it because I have not been given an opportunity to exercise my judgment. I want to move an amendment. But it has been ruled by Your Excellency that no amendments will be allowed. This is a procedure which is unheard of, not known to any constitution but since the ruling is given, I must bow to it.

* * * * * *

Part—II
(1920)

Home Rule League

In October, 1920, Mrs. Annie Besant resigned the Presidentship of the All-India Home Rule League. Mr. Gandhi was elected its new president. He proposed to change its creed and rename it as Swaraj Sabha.

A general meeting of the members of the All-India Home Rule League was held on the 3rd of October, 1920, in Bombay when Gandhi presided. After the notice convening the meeting was read, the consideration of the draft of the amended constitution of the League was taken up. The first article regarding the change of name was agreed to without discussion. But regarding Article 2, covering the objects of the Sabha, there was a heated discussion lasting over two hours. The article as drafted by the Sub-Committee of the Central Council of the League ran thus :

(i) To secure complete Swaraj for India according to the wishes of the Indian people.

(ii) To carry on a continuous propaganda with a view to organising the people for peaceful and effective action to achieve such Swaraj, and to take such action whenever necessary.

(iii) The interpretation of the word "Swaraj" as used herein shall not be extended beyond Article 1 of the Congress Constitution.

There were five amendments, two of which were tabled by Jinnah, and when the discussion came up before the meeting he moved his first one that Article 2 should read: "To secure Swaraj for India in conformity with Article 1 of the Constitution of the Indian National Congress" and clauses 2 and 3 should be omitted. In a somewhat lengthy speech he explained the reasons that had led him to press the amendment and said that the constitution of the Home Rule League laid down three things; first, that they were to secure self-government within the British Commonwealth and were to be recognised as free and equal members of the Commonwealth; second, this goal was to be attained by constitutional methods; and third, that the British connection was to be maintained and strengthened. Any change in their constitution, therefore, which went against these two propositions, namely, the attainment of complete self-government within the the British Commonwealth and the adoption of constitutional methods was a position which could not be taken up, especially as they were affiliated to the Indian National Congress. Therefore, they could only lay down as their object, the securing of Swaraj in conformity with Article 1 of the Congress Constitution. The proposed change meant the declaration of complete independence and severance from the British Commonwealth and it did not lay down the form of Government but left it to the

wishes of the people of India. The methods laid down in the proposed change would be peaceful but not necessarily constitutional and law-abiding. Moti Lal Nehru spoke against the amendment and after a considerable discussion, it was lost when put to the vote.

Jinnah then moved his second amendment to the effect that Swaraj shall mean responsible government. This one too, on being put to the vote, was lost. After this he pointed out that the constitution of the Home Rule League could not be changed except by the Council and that when three-fourths of the members voted for it. The chair, however, ruled that this meeting was competent enough to carry the changes with a bare majority, and, in reply to Jamnadas Dwarkadas, the Chairman announced that "it was open to any member, be he life member or otherwise, to resign his membership if he thought he could not remain a member of the Sabha under its altered constitution."

The consequences of the change in the Home Rule League's object and name was that a very large number of people led by Jinnah resigned. On or about 25th October, 1920, the following joint letter of resignation was addressed by Mr. Jinnah and others to Mr. Gandhi:

We, the undersigned members of the League, are of opinion that the Constitution adopted by the League in its General Meeting held in the Morarji Hall on the 3rd instant constitutes a fundamental departure from the aims, objects and methods of work hitherto pursued by the League. The new Constitution deliberately omits any reference to the

British connection in Clause 2 (1) which lays down the goal of the League and Clause 2 (2) thereof is clearly permissible of unconstitutional and illegal activities provided they are peaceful and effective. We are further of opinion that these changes in the Constitution were made by adopting a procedure contrary to the rules and regulations of the League. We venture to say that your ruling, aiming at validating the said procedure, was both incorrect and arbitrary. We hold to the ideas and methods embodied in the Congress Constitution and we further believe that a body like the League, affiliated as it is to the Indian National Congress, must restrict itself to methods of work which were considered by the Indian National Congress as constitutional.

Anxious as we are to assist the League in its mission of strengthening and furthering the cause of the Indian National Congress, we regret that, owing to the radical alterations recently made in the Constitution, we are unable to remain any longer members of the League.

We, therefore, with great sorrow, tender our resignation of our membership of the League and of such offices thereof as are at present held by any of us.

We remain,

Yours faithfully,

M.A. Jinnah
M.R. Jayakar
Jamnadas Dwarkadas
Kanji Dwarkadas
K.M. Munshi

Hiralal Nanavaty
Nagindas Master
Culabchand Deochand
Chotubhai Vakil
Mangaldas Pakvasa

R.G. Munsif	Chandrashankar Pandya
M.K. Azad	N.B. Vibhakar
Morarji Kamdar	Manilal Nanavaty
Jamnadas Mehta	Y.M. Pakwasa
Hansraj Pragji Thackersey	

On 25th October, 1920, Mr. Gandhi wrote a letter to Mr. Jinnah and others that his ruling on the validity of the change of the constitution was strictly correct and that apart from technical objections, the seceders' implication that the revised constitution was not for British connection was wrong as the meaning of Swarajya was confined to the Congress goal. Appealing to Mr. Jinnah and others to reconsider their resignations, Mr. Gandhi said :

I am not opposed to the British connection by itself, but I do not wish to make a fetish of it. I will not keep for a single minute under slavery for sake of that connection. But I and those who think with me have limited our ambition in order that we can carry the Congress with us and be thus enabled to remain affiliated to that body. I entirely dissent from you that Clause 2 permits unconstitutional or illegal activities. The words 'unconstitutional and illegal' are highly technical terms. The ex-Advocate-General of Madras considers non-co-operation to be unconstitutional. You consider it to be perfectly constitutional. The President of the Special Congress gave it as his considered ruling that my resolution was not unconstitutional. As not an indifferent lawyer of 20 years of unbroken practice I confess it as difficult for me to conceive

an illustration under British Constitution of unconstitutional activity except it be violence and violence has been specifically eschewed from the Sabha Constitution. Similarly about the word 'illegal' jurists have difference on its interpretation. A cyclist cycling without a lamp to fetch a doctor acts contrary to law, but does not engage in illegal activity. He voluntarily pays the fine and thus honours law. To disregard tyrannical administrative order may be contrary to law but it is not in my opinion illegal activity. To make strong speeches amounting in the opinion of erratic judges to sedition is not illegal activity. In placing before you for your consideration these homely illustrations my purpose is to show that it is a most dangerous thing for the country fighting for its very life, its honour and its religion to tie itself down in a knot of indefinable expressions. Surely all public bodies will think out for themselves the methods to be adopted for winning freedom for the country. I personally take unconstitutionalism and illegalities but refuse to make a fetish of these as I refuse to make a fetish of British connection.

Mr. Jinnah, in reply, recalled the events preceding the Bombay meeting at which the change in the constitution of Swaraj Sabha was adopted and again urged that as the Executive Council of the All-India Home Rule League cannot alter the constitution except by three-fourths majority, therefore a *fortiori*, general meeting should not be able to do so. With regard to the British connection, Mr. Jinnah said he also did not make a fetish of it, but he maintained that statesmanship, wisdom and

commonsense dictated India should attain full freedom within the British Commonwealth as an equal, and independent member. Mr. Jinnah added:

I thank you for your kind suggestion offering me 'to take my share in the new life that has opened up before the country.' If by 'new life' you mean your methods and your programme, I am afraid I cannot accept them; for I am fully convinced that it must lead to disaster. But the actual new life that has opened up before the country is that we are faced with a Government that pays no heed to the grievances, feelings and sentiments of the people; that our own countrymen are divided; the Moderate Party is still going wrong; that your methods have already caused split and division in almost every institution that you have approached hitherto, and in the public life of the country not only amongst Hindus and Muslims but between Hindus and Hindus and Muslims and Muslims and even between fathers and sons; people generally are desperate all over the country and your extreme programme has for the moment struck the imagination mostly of the inexperience youth and the ignorant and the illiterate. All this means complete disorganisation and chaos. What the consequence of this may be, I shudder to contemplate; but I, for one, am convinced that the present policy of the Government is the primary cause of it all and unless that cause is removed, the effects must continue. I have no voice or power to remove the cause; but at the same time I do not wish my countrymen to be dragged to the brink of a precipice in order to be shattered. The only way for the Nationalists is to

unite and work for a programme which is universally acceptable for the early attainment of complete responsible government. Such a programme cannot be dictated by any single individual, but must have the approval and support of all the prominent Nationalist leaders in the country; and to achieve this end I am sure my colleagues and myself shall continue to work.

* * * * * *

M. K. GANDHI

On April 24, 1943, addressing the session of the Muslim League at Delhi, Quaid-e-Azam said: "Nobody would welcome it more than myself if Mr. Gandhi is even now really willing to come to a settlement with the Muslim League on the basis of Pakistan. Let me tell you that it will be the greatest day both for the Hindus and Mussalmans. If he has made up his mind, what is there to prevent Mr. Gandhi from writing direct to me." Thereafter Mr. Gandhi wrote the above letter. In a statement issued on May 28,1943, Quaid-e-Azam explained the position: "I have received a communication from the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated May 24, that Mr. Gandhi's letter merely expresses a wish to meet me, and this letter, Government have decided, cannot be forwarded to me. This letter of Mr. Gandhi can only be construed as a move on his part to embroll the Muslim League to come into clash with the British Government solely for the purpose of helping his release, so that he would be free to do what he pleases thereafter. There is really no change of policy on the part of Mr. Gandhi and no genuine desire to meet the suggestions that I made in my speech during the session of the All-India Muslim League at Delhi. Although I have always been ready and willing to meet Mr. Gandhi or any other Hindu leader and shall be still glad to meet him, yet merely expressing his desire to meet me is not the kind of ephemeral letter that I suggested in my speech that Mr. Gandhi should write, and which has been now stopped by the Government."

Detention Camp,
Dated 4th May, 1943

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

When sometimes after my incarceration, Government asked me for a list of newspapers I would like to have, I included the 'Dawn' in my list. I have received it with more or less regularity.

Whenever it comes to me I read it carefully. I have followed the proceedings of the League as reported in the 'Dawn' columns I noted your invitation to me to write to you. Hence this letter.

I welcome your invitation. I suggest our meeting face to face rather than talking through correspondence. But I am in your hands.

I hope that this letter will be sent to you and, if you agree to my proposal, that the Government will let you visit me.

One thing I had better mention. There seems to be an "if" about your invitation. Do you say I should write only if I have changed my heart? God alone knows men's hearts.

I would like you to take me as I am.

Why should not both you and I approach the great question of communal unity as men determined on finding a common solution and work

together to make our solution acceptable to all who are concerned with it or are interested in it?

Yours sincerely,

M.K. Gandhi

1944

Translation of Mr. Gandhi's letter in Gujrati

"Dilkusha", Panchgani,

Dated: 17.7.1944

Brother Jinnah,

There was a day when I could induce you to speak in the mother tongue. To-day I take courage to write to you in the same language. I had invited you to meet me while I was in Jail. I have not written to you since my release. But to-day my heart says that I should write to you. We will meet whenever you choose. Don't regard me as the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country. I am the friend and servant of not only yourself but of the whole world. Do not disappoint me.

I am enclosing herewith a translation of this letter in Urdu.

Your brother,

Gandhi

Mr. M.A. Jinnah's reply to Mr. Gandhi

H.B. "Queen Elizabeth"
Srinagar, Kashmir,
Dated 24th July, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I received your letter dated 17th of July here on the 22nd of July, and I thank you for it.

I shall be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which will probably be about the middle of August. By that time I hope that you will have recuperated your health fully and will be returning to Bombay. I would like to say nothing more till we meet.

I am very very pleased to read in the Press that you are making very good progress, and I hope that you will soon be all right.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

1944

Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

September 10, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

With reference to our talk yesterday (September 9), I understood from you that you had come to

discuss the Hindus-Muslim settlement with me in your individual capacity, and not in any representative character or capacity, on behalf of the Hindus or the Congress; nor had you any authority to do so. I naturally pointed out to you that there must be some one on the other side with authority holding a representative status with whom I can negotiate and, if possible, come to a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, and that for the position you had adopted there was no precedent, and that this raises great difficulties in my way.

As you know, I can only speak on behalf of Muslim India and the All-India Muslim League, as the President of the organization which I represent, and as such I am subject to and governed by its constitution, rules and regulations. I think you realize and will admit that a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question is the foremost and major hurdle, and unless the representatives of these two nations put their heads together, how is one to make any headway with it?

Nevertheless, I explained to you the Lahore Resolution of March, 1940, and tried to persuade you to accept the basic and fundamental principles embodied in it, but you not only refused to consider it but emphasized your opposition to the basis indicated in that resolution, and remarked that there was "an ocean between you and me," and when I asked you what is then the alternative you suggest, you put forward a formula of Mr. Rajagopalachari approved by you. We discussed it, and as various matters were vague and nebulous, and some

required clarification, I wanted to have a clear idea of what it really meant and what were its implications, and asked you for explanations and clarification regarding the proposals embodied in that formula.

After some discussion, you requested me to formulate in writing my points that I thought required or called for explanation and clarification, and to communicate with you and that you would reply in writing before our next meeting on Monday, September 11, at 5.30 p.m. I am, therefore, submitting to you the following points which require clarification:

(1) With regard to the preamble: In what capacity will you be a consenting party if any agreement is reached between you and me?

(2) Clause 1: With regard to "the constitution for a free India" referred to in this clause, I would like to know first, what constitution do you refer to, who will frame it and when will it come into being?

Next, it is stated in the formula that "the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for Independence." Does it mean the Congress demand for Independence as formulated in the August Resolution of 1942 by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay or, if not, what is the significance of this term, for you know the Muslim League has made it clear not only by its resolutions but by its creed, which is embodied in its constitution,

that we stand for freedom and independence of the whole of this sub-continent, and applies to Pakistan and Hindustan.

Next it is stated that the Muslim League "will co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a provisional interim government for the transitional period." I would like to know the basis or the lines on which such a government is to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme please let me have it.

(3) Clause 2: Who will appoint the commission referred to in this clause and who will give effect to their findings? What is the meaning of "absolute majority" referred to in it? Will the contemplated plebiscite be taken districtwise or, if not, on what basis? Who will determine and decide whether such a plebiscite should be based on adult franchise or other practicable franchise? Who will give effect to the decision or verdict of the above-mentioned plebiscite? Would only the districts on the border, which are taken out from the boundaries of the present provinces by delimitation, be entitled to choose to join either State, or would also those outside the present boundaries have the right to choose to join either State?

(4) Clause 3: Who are meant by "all parties" in this clause?

(5) Clause 4: I would like to know between whom and through what machinery and agency will the "mutual agreements" referred to in this

clause be entered into? What is meant by "safeguarding defence, commerce and communications and for other essential purposes"? Safe-guarding against whom?

(6) Clause 6: "These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the governance of India." I would like to know to whom is this power to be transferred, through what machinery and agency, and when?

These are some of the important points that occur to me for the moment, which require explanation and clarification, and I hope that you will let me have full details about the various points that I have raised, in order that I may be better able to understand and judge your proposals before I can deal with them satisfactorily.

Yours sincerely,

M.A. Jinnah.

II

MR. GANDHI TO MR. JINNAH

September 11, 1944

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

I received your letter yesterday at 3-30 p.m. I was in the midst of appointments. I hasten to reply at the earliest opportunity.

I have said in my letter to you, it is implied in the Rajaji Formula and I have stated publicly that I have approached you as an individual. My life mission has been Hindu-Muslim unity which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling power being ousted. Hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving Independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together.

I am glad, therefore, that you did not break off our talks when I refused to assume or accept representative capacity. Of course, I am pledged to use all the influence I may have with the Congress to ratify my agreement with you. May I remind you that the Rajaji Formula was designed in the first instance for your acceptance and submission thereafter to the League?

It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But had no reference to the Lahore Resolution of the League. The Lahore Resolution is indefinite. Rajaji has taken from it the substance and given it a shape.

Now for the points raised by you.

1. I have already answered this in the foregoing.

2. The constitution will be framed by provisional government contemplated in the Formula or an authority specially set up by it after the British power is withdrawn. The Independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands. The basis for the formation of the provisional interim government will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress.

3. The commission will be appointed by the provisional government. 'Absolute majority' means a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province. The form of plebiscite and the franchise must be a matter for discussion.

4. "All parties" means parties interested.

5. "Mutual agreement" means agreement between contracting parties. "Safeguarding defence, etc.," means for me a central or joint board of control. "Safeguarding" means safeguarding against all who may put the common interests in jeopardy.

6. The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is, to the provisional government. The formula contemplates peaceful transfer by the British Government. So far as I am concerned I would like the transfer to take place as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

III

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI

September 11, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I received your letter of September 11 at 5 p.m. today. I note that you have approached me as an individual, and I have already expressed my views about it. Please do not take it that I acquiesce in the position that you have adopted, for which there is no precedent. *Nevertheless, I proceeded to discuss matters with you naturally because I am anxious to convert you to my point of view if possible. I urged on you that the only solution of India's problem is to accept the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan, as briefly laid down in the Lahore Resolution of March 1940, and proceed to settle the details forthwith. You say the Lahore resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explantion of the resolution, but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and the fundamental principles embodied in it. I would, therefore, like to know in what way or respect the Lahore Resolution is indefinite. I cannot agree that Rajaji has taken

* In its report of the proceedings of the Muslim League session of July 1944 at Lahore, the "Dawn" in its issue of July 31 said: "On the League Council authorizing Mr. Jinnah to carry on negotiations with Mr. Gandhi, the Qaid-i-Azam ruled that all the resolutions on the agenda relating to the C. R. Gandhi formula could not be moved and the movers, accordingly, withdrew the resolutions." Similar reports appeared in other papers.

from it its substance and given it shape. On the contrary, he has not only put it out of shape but mutilated it, as I explained in my speech which I delivered at the meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore on July 30, 1944.

You say "the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving Independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together." This in my opinion is, as I have repeatedly said, putting the cart before the horse, and is generally opposed to the policy and declarations of the All-India Muslim League, and you are only holding on firmly to the August resolution of 1942. In order to achieve the freedom and independence of the people of India, it is essential, in the first instance, that there should be a Hindu—Muslim settlement.

Of course, I am thankful to you when you say that you are pledged to use all the influence that you have with the Congress to ratify your agreement with me, but that is not enough in my judgment, although it will be a very valuable help to me.

I once more ask you please to let me know what is your conception of the basis for the formation of a provisional interim government. No doubt it will be subject to agreement between the League and the Congress, but I think in fairness

you should at least give me some rough idea or lines of your conception, for you must have thought it out by now, and I would like to know what are your proposals or scheme for the formation of a provisional interim government, which can give me some clear picture to understand it.

You have omitted to answer my question as to who will give effect to the findings of the commission and also it is not clear to me what you mean by absolute majority, when you say it means "a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province." You have not even replied to my question as to who will decide the form of the plebiscite and the franchise contemplated by the formula.

The answer to the fourth point does not carry any clear idea when you say "all parties" means "parties interested."

You say "mutual agreement" means 'agreement between contracting parties'" Who are the the contracting parties once a provisional interim government is established of your conception? Who will appoint the central or joint board of control, which will safeguard defence, etc., and on what principle, through what machinery and agency, and subject to whose control and orders will such a central or joint board be?

You say "The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is, to the provisional government." That is all the greater reason why I would like to

know full details of the provisional government as contemplated by you and of your conception.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

IV

MR. JINNAH TO MR. GANDHI

September, 13, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

When you arrived here on the morning of September 12, to resume our talks, you were good enough to inform me that you had not had time to attend to my letter of September 11, which reached you the same day at 10.30 p.m. We met again today without having received your reply, and I am still waiting for it. Please, therefore, let me have your reply as soon as possible with regard to the various points mentioned in my letter to you of September 11.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

V

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH.

September 14, 1944

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

I have your letter of the 13th instant. I understood from our talks that you were in no hurry for my answer. I was, therefore, taking the matter in a leisurely fashion, even hoping that as our talks proceeded and as cordiality increased mutual clarification would come of itself and that we would only have to record our final agreement. But I understand and appreciate the other viewpoint. We should take nothing for granted. I should clarify your difficulties in understanding the Rajaji formula and you should do likewise regarding yours, i.e., the Muslim League Lahore Resolution of 1940.

With reference to the Lahore Resolution as agreed between us I shall deal with it in a separate letter.

Perhaps at the end of our discussion, we shall discover that Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore Resolution out of shape and mutilated it, but has given it substance and form.

Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji Formula, I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the

Lahore Resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement.

So much for the first paragraph of your letter.

As to the second, I do hold that unless we oust the third party we shall not be able to live at peace with one another. That does not mean I may not make an effort to find ways and means of establishing a living peace between us.

You ask for my conception of the basis for a provisional interim government. I would have told you if I had any scheme in mind. I imagine that if we two can agree, it would be for us to consult the other parties. I can say this, that any provisional government to inspire confidence at the present moment must represent all parties. When that moment arrives I shall have been replaced by some authoritative person, though you will have me always at your back and call when you have converted me, or I you, or by mutual conversion we have become one mind functioning through two bodies.

As to the third point, the provisional government being the appointing authority, will give effect to the findings of the commission. This, I thought, was implied in my previous answer.

Rajaji tells me that 'absolute majority' is used in his Formula in the same sense as it is used in ordinary legal parlance wherever more than two groups are dealt with. I cling to my own answer.

But you will perhaps suggest a third meaning and persuade me to accept it.

The form of the plebiscite and franchise must be left to be decided by the provisional interim government unless we decide it now. I should say it should be by adult suffrage of all the inhabitants of the Pakistan area.

As to fourth, "all parties" means you and I and every one else holding views on the question at issue will, and should, seek by peaceful persuasion to influence public opinion as is done where democracy functions wholly or in part.

As to fifth, supposing that the result of the plebiscite is in favour of partition, the provisional government will draft the treaty and agreements as regards the administration of matters of common interest, but the same has to be confirmed and ratified by the governments of the two States. The machinery required for the sttlement and administration of matters of common interest will in the first instance be planned by the interim government, but subsequently will be a matter for settlement between the two governments acting through the agencies appointed by each for that purpose.

As to sixth, I hope the foregoing makes superfluous any further reply.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

VI

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI

September 14, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I received your letter of September 14, at 4-45 p.m. today in reply to my letter of September 11, (and not of September 13, as you state, which seems to be a mistake), and I thank you for it.

Please let me have, as soon as you can, your promised letter indicating in what way or respect the Lahore Resolution is 'indefinite.'

With regard to the provision in the Gandhi-Rajaji Formula that "the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for Independence," I asked you in my letter dated September 10, "Does it mean the Congress demand for Independence as formulated in the August 1942 Resolution by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay or, if not, what is the significance of this term," to this you replied by your letter of September 11, "the Independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands". Hence, I again ask, does it mean on the basis of a united India? I find that you have not clarified this point satisfactorily.

As regards the next part of this clause, the formula proceeds to lay down that "the Muslim League will co-operate with the Congress in the

formation of the provisional interim government for the transitional period," I requested you by my letter of September 10 to let me know "the basis or the lines by which such a government is to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme, please let me have it," to this you replied by your letter of September 11 under reply, that "the basis for the formation of the provisional interim government will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress." But that is not meeting my request for clarification or giving me at least the outlines of such a government, and that is what I have been asking for. I hope that you do appreciate my point when I am requesting you to let me have rough outlines of the proposed provisional interim government according to the formula, so that I may have some idea.

Of course, I can quite understand that such a provisional interim government will request all parties and would be of a character that will inspire confidence at the present moment of all the parties. I can quite understand that when the moment arrives certain things may follow, but before we can deal with this formula in a satisfactory manner, I repeat again that, as it is your formula, you should give me a rough idea of the provisional interim government that you contemplate and of your conception.

What I would like to know would be, what will be the powers of such a provisional interim government, how it will be formed, to whom it will be responsible, and what its composition will

be, etc. You being the sponsor of this Gandhi-Rajaji formula, should give me some rough idea and picture of it, so that I may understand what this part of the formula means.

In your letter of September 14, in reply to my letter of September 11, you inform me that you would have told me if you had any scheme in mind. "I imagine that if we two can agree it would be for us to consult the other parties," but that is just the point. Unless, I have some outlines or scheme, however rough, from you, what are we to discuss in order to reach any agreement?

As regards the other matters which you have further explained, I have noted the explanation, and I do not think I need press you further, although some of them are not quite satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

VII

GANDHI TO MR. JINNAH

September 15, 1944

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

This is in terms of our talk of Wednesday, September 13.

For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji Formula and, with your assistance, am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League.

You must admit that the Resolution iteslf makes no reference to the two nations theory. In the course of our discussions you have passionately pleaded that India contains two nations, i.e., Hindus and Muslims, and that the latter have their homelands in India as the former have theirs.

The more our argument progresses, the more alarming your picture appears to me. It would be alluring if it were true. But my fear is growing that it is wholly unreal. I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children.

You do not claim to be a separate nation by right of conquest but by reason of acceptance of Islam. Will the two nations become one if the whole of India accepted Islam? Will Bengalis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamilians, Maharashtrians, Gujaraties, etc., cease to have their special characteristics if all of them became converts to Islam?

These have all become one politically because they are subject to one foreign control. They are trying today to throw off that subjection.

You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood, if I accept it, I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem.

The only real, though lawful test of our nationhood arises out of our common political subjection. If you and I throw off this subjection by our combined effort we shall be born a politically free nation out of our travail. If by then we have not learnt to prize our freedom we may quarrel among ourselves and, for want of a common master holding us together in his iron grip, seek to split up into small groups or nationalities. There will be nothing to prevent us from descending to that level and we shall not have to go in search of a master. There are many claimants to the throne that never remains vacant.

With this background I shall present you with my difficulty in accepting your resolution:

(1) Pakistan is not in the resolution. Does it bear the original meaning the Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan out of which the name was formed? If not, what is it?

(2) Is the goal of Pakistan pan-Islam?

(3) What is it that distinguishes an Indian Muslim from every other Indian, if not his religion? Is he different from a Turk or an Arab?

(4) What is the connotation of the word "Muslims" in the resolution under discussion?

Does it mean the Muslims of the India of geography or of the Pakistan to be?

(5) Is the resolution addressed to Muslims by way of education, or to the inhabitants of the whole of India by way of appeal or to the foreign ruler as an ultimatum?

(6) Are the constituents in the two zones to constitute "independent States," an undefined number in each zone?

(7) Is the demarcation to take place during the pendency of British rule?

(8) If the answer to the last question is in the affirmative, the proposal must be accepted first by Britain and then imposed upon India, not evolved from within by the free will of the people of India!!!

(9) Have you examined the position and satisfied yourself that these "independent States" will be materially and otherwise benefited by being split up into fragments,

(10) Please satisfy me that these independent sovereign States will not become a collection of poor States, a menace to themselves and to the rest of India.

(11) Pray show me by facts and figures or otherwise how independence and welfare of India as a whole can be brought about by the acceptance of the resolution?

(12) How are Muslims under the Princes to be disposed of as a result of this scheme?

(13) What is your definition of "minorities?"

(14) Will you please define the "adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards" for minorities referred to in the second part of the resolution?

(15) Do you not see that the Lahore Resolution contains only a bare statement of the objective and does not give any idea as to the means to be adopted for the execution of the idea and the concrete corollaries thereof?

For instance:

(a) Are the people in the regions falling under the plant to have any voice in the matter of separation and, if so, how is it to be ascertained?

(b) What is the provision for Defence and similar matters of common concern contemplated in the Lahore Resolution?

(c) There are many groups of Muslims who have continuously expressed dissent from the policy of the League. While I am prepared to accept the preponderating influence and position of the League and have approached you for that very reason, is it not our joint duty to remove their doubts and carry them with us by making them feel that they and their supporters have not been practically disfranchised?

(d) Does this not lead again to placing the Resolution of the League before the people of the zones concerned as a whole for acceptance?

As I write this letter and imagine the working of the Resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India. Believe me, I approach you as a seeker. Though I represent nobody but myself, I aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India. For, I realize in my own person their misery and degradation which is their common lot irrespective of class, caste or creed. I know that you have acquired a unique hold on the Muslim masses. I want you to use your influence for their total welfare, which must include the rest.

In this hastily written letter I have only given an inkling of my difficulty.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

VIII

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH

September 15, 1944

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

I have yours of September 14, received at 9-40 a.m. I woke up at 3 a.m. today to finish my promised letter on the Lahore Resolution. There

is no miskate about the date, for I wrote in answer to your reminder of September 13.

Independence does mean as envisaged in the A.I.C.C. resolution of 1942. But it cannot be on the basis of a united India. If we come to a settlement it would be on the basis of that settlement, assuming of course that it secures general acceptance in the country. The process will be somewhat like this. We reach by joint effort independence for India as it stands. India, become free, will proceed to demarcation, plebiscite and partition if the people concerned vote for Partition. All this is implied in the Rajaji formula.

As to the provisional interim government, I am afraid I cannot carry my answer any further than I have done. Though I have no scheme for such a government, if you have one in connection with the Lahore Resolution, which also I presume requires an interim government, we can discuss it.

The Formula was framed by Rajaji in good faith. I accepted it in equal good faith. The hope was that you would look at it with favour. We still think it to be the best in the circumstances. You and I have to put flesh on it, if we can. I have explained the process we have to go through. You have no objection to it. Perhaps, you want to know how I would form the provisional government if I was invited to form it. If I was in that unenviable position I could see all the claimants and endeavour to satisfy them. My co-operation will be available in that task.

I can give you full satisfaction about your inquiry, "What I would like to know would be: what will be the powers of such a provisional interim Government, how will it be formed, to whom will it be responsible?" The provisional interim government will be responsible to the elected members of the present Assembly or a newly elected one. It will have all the powers less than that of the Commander-in-Chief during the war and full powers thereafter. It will be the authority to give effect to the agreement that may be arrived at between the League and the Congress and ratified by the other parties.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

IX

MR. JINNAH TO MR. GANDHI

September 17, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I have your letter of September 15, and I thank you for it. I note that you have for the moment shunted "the Rajaji Formula" and are applying your mind very seriously to the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League. It is my duty to explain the Lahore Resolution to you today and persuade you to accept it, even though you are talking to me, as you have often made it clear, in

your individual capacity. I have successfully converted non-Muslim Indians in no small number and also a large body of foreigners, and if I can convert you, exercising as you do tremendous influence over Hindu India, it will be no small assistance to me, although we are not proceeding on the footing that you are carrying on these talks in your representative character, or capacity, and my difficulties remain until you are vested with a representative status and authority in order to negotiate and reach an agreement with you.

You have stated in your letter dated September 11, that the Lahore Resolution is "indefinite." I, therefore, naturally asked you please to let me know in what way or respect the Lahore Resolution is indefinite. And now I have received your letter of September 15 under reply.

The third paragraph of your letter is not seeking clarification but is a disquisition and expression of your views on the point whether the Mussalmans are a nation. This matter can hardly be discussed by means of correspondence. There is a greater deal of discussion and literature on this point which is available, and it is for you to judge finally, when you have studied this question thoroughly, whether the Mussalmans and Hindus are not two major nations in this subcontinent. For the moment I would refer you to two publications although there are many more,—Dr. Ambedkar's book and M.R.T.'s "Nationalism in Conflict in India." We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or

test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and, what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions-in short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation. Now I shall reply to your various points :

(1) Yes, the word "Pakistan" is not mentioned in the resolution, and it does not bear the original meaning. The word has now become synonymous with the Lahore Resolution.

(2) This point does not arise, but still I reply that the question is a mere bogey.

(3) This point is covered by my answer that the Mussalmans of India are a nation. As to the last part of your query, it is hardly relevant to the matter of clarification of the resolution.

(4) Surely you know what the word "Muslims" means.

(5) This point does not arise by way of clarification of the text of the Lahore resolution.

(6) No. They will form units of Pakistan.

(7) As soon as the basis and the principles

embodied in the Lahore resolution are accepted, the question of demarcation will have to be taken up immediately.

(8) In view of my reply to (7), your question (8) has been answered.

(9) Does not relate to clarification.

(10) My answer to (9) covers this point.

(11) Does not arise out of the clarification of the resolution. Surely this is not asking for clarification of the resolution. I have in numerous speeches of mine and the Muslim League in its resolutions have pointed out that this is the only solution of India's problem and the road to achieve freedom and independence of the peoples of India.

(12) "Muslims under the Princes": The Lahore resolution is only confined to British India. This question does not arise out of the clarification of the resolution.

(13) The definition of "minorities": You yourslef have often said "minorities" means "accepted minorities".

(14) The adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards for minorities, referred to in the resolution, are a matter for negotiation and settlement with the minorities in the respective States, viz., Pakistan and Hindustan.

(15) It does give basic principles and when they are accepted then the details will have to be worked out by the contracting parties.

(a) Does not arise by way of clarification.
(b) Does not arise by way of clarification.
(c) The Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organization of Muslim India.
(d No); see answer (c)

As regards your final paragraph, before receiving clarification from me you have already passed your judgment and condemned the Lahore Resolution, when you say, "As I write this letter and imagine the whole working of the resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India." I understand that you have made clear to me that you represent nobody but yourself, and I am trying to persuade you and to convert you that this is the road which will lead us to the achievement of freedom and independence not only of the two major nations, Hindus and Muslims, but of the rest of the peoples of India, but when you proceed to say that you aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India, I regret I cannot accept that statement of yours.

It is quite clear that you represent nobody else but the Hindus, and as long as you do not realize your true position and the realities, it is very difficult for me to argue with you, and it becomes still more difficult to persuade you, and hope to convert you to the realities and the actual

conditions prevailing in India today. I am pleading before you in the hope of converting you, as I have done with many others successfully.

As I have said before, you are a great man and you exercise enormous influence over the Hindus, particularly the masses, and by accepting the road that I am pointing out to you, you are not prejudicing or harming the interests of the Hindus or of the minorities. On the contrary, Hindus will be the greatest gainers. I am convinced that true welfare not only of the Muslims but the rest of India lies in the division of India as proposed by the Lahore resolution. It is for you to consider whether it is not your policy and programme in which you have persisted which has been the principal factor of the "ruin of whole of India" and of the misery and degradation of the people to which you refer and which I deplore no less than anyone else. And it is for that very reason I am pleading before you all these days, although you insist that you are having talks with me only in your individual capacity, in the hope that you may yet revise your policy and programme.

Yours sinerely,

M. A. Jinnah

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH

September 19, 1944

Dear Quaid-e-Azam,

Many thanks for yours of 17th inst.

I am sorry to have to say that your answers, omitting 1, 2 and 6 do not give satisfaction.

It may be that all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore resolution. But I contend that they are very relevant from the standpoint of a seeker that I am. You cannot expect anyone to agree to, or shoulder the burden of the claim contained in the Lahore resolution without; for instance, answering my question 15 (a) and 15 (b) which you brush aside as not arising by way of clarification.

Dr. Ambedkar's thesis, while it is ably written, has carried no conviction to me. The other book mentioned by you, I am sorry to say, I have not seen.

Why can you not accept my statement that I aspire to represent all the sections that compose the people of India? Do you not aspire? Should not every Indian? That the aspiration may never be realized is beside the point.

I am beholden to you, in spite of your opinion about me, for having patience with me; I hope you will never lose it but will persevere in your effort to convert me. I ask you to take me with my strong views and even prejudices, if I am guilty of any.

As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ. For, I am wholly unrepentant. My purpose is, as a lover of communal unity, to place my service at your disposal.

I hope you do not expect me to accept the Lahore resolution without understanding its implications. If your letter is the final word, there is still hope. Can we not agree to differ on the question of "two nations" and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination? It is this basis that has brought me to you. If the regions holding Muslim majorities have to be separated according to the Lahore Resolution, the grave step of separation should be specifically placed before and approved by the people in that area.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI.

September 21, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 19, and 1 have already given you my answers to all your questions relating to clarification of the Lahore resolution or any part of it, and I am glad that you admit when you say it may be that "all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore resolution," but you particularly emphasise your points 15 (a) 15 (b).

I regret to say it has no relation to the context of the resolution or any part thereof. You have

brought so many matters into our correspondence which are entirely outside the matter requiring clarification, so I have perforce to deal with them. Let me first deal with your letter of September 11.

You say: "My life-mission has been Hindu-Muslim unity which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling Power being ousted. Hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving of Independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together."

The gist of your letters up to date is that you are wedded to this policy and will pursue it. In your next letter of September 14, while you were good enough to furnish me with the clarification of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to observe: "I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement."

In your letter of September 15, you say: "Independence does mean as envisaged in the A.I.C.C. resolution of 1942." It is, therefore, clear that you are not prepared to revise your policy and that you adhere firmly to your policy and programme which you have persisted in and which culminated in your demand, final policy, programme, and the method and sanction for enforcing it by resorting

to mass civil disobedience in terms of the 8th August, 1942, resolution, and you have made it more clear again by stating in your letter of September 19, as follows:— "As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ, for I am wholly unrepentant." You know that the August 1942, resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India.

Then, again, in the course of our discussion when I asked you for clarification of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to say, by your letter of September 15, as follows :— "For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League." We discussed it in its various aspects, as you told me you were open to be persuaded and converted to our point of view. I discussed the resolution at great length with you, and explained everything you wanted to understand, even though you have emphasized more than once that you are having these talks with me in your personal capacity, and in your letter of September 15, you assured me in the following words with regard to the Lahore resolution: "Believe me, I approach you as a seeker, though I represent nobody but myself," and that you were open to conviction and conversion.

You had informed me by your letter of September 11, as follows : "It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But that had no reference to the Lahore resolution of the League.

The League resolution is indefinite." I naturally, therefore, proceeded in reply, to ask you by my letter of September 11, as follows:— "You say the Lahore resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explanation of the terms of the resolution; but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and the fundamental principle embodied in it. I would therefore, like to know in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is indefinite," and I sent you a reminder on September 13, to which you replied by your letter of September 15, not confining yourself really to matters of clarification, but introducing other extraneous matters, with some of which I had already dealt, in reply to this letter of yours of September 15, by my letter of September 17, and furnished you with all the clarifications, informing you that you had introduced several matters which could hardly be discussed in a satisfactory manner by means of correspondence.

I have already given you all the clarifications you require so far as the Lahore resolution goes and its text is concerned. You again raise further arguments, reasons and grounds and continue to persist in a disquisition on the point, amongst others, whether Muslims of India are a nation, and then you proceed further to say: "Can we not agree to differ on the question of 'two nations' and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination?"

It seems to me that you are labouring under some misconception of the real meaning of the word "self-determination". Apart from the inconsis-

tencies and contradictions of the various positions that you have adopted in the course of our correspondence, as indicated above, can you not appreciate our point of view that we claim the right of self-determination as a nation and not as a territorial unit, and that we are entitled to exercise our inherent right as a Muslim nation, which is our birth-right? Whereas you are labouring under the wrong idea that "self-determination" means only that of "a territorial unit," which, by the way, is neither demarcated nor defined yet, and there is no union or federal constitution of India in being, functioning as a sovereign Central government. Ours is a case of division and carving out two independent soverign States by way of settlement between two major nations, Hindus and Muslims, and not of severance or secession from any existing union, which is non set in India. The right of self-determination, which we claim, postulates that we are a nation, and as such it would be the self-determination of the Muslims, and they alone are entitled to exercise that right.

I hope you will now understand that your question 15(a) does not arise out of the Lahore resolution or of any part thereof. As to 15(b), again it does not arise as a matter of clarification, for it will be a matter for the constitution—making body chosen by Pakistan to deal with and decide all matters as a sovereign body representing Pakistan vis-a-vis the constitution-making body of Hindustan or any other party concerned. There cannot be defence and similar matters of "common concern," when it is accepted that Pakistan and Hindustan

will be two separate independent sovereign States. I hope I have now given all satisfactory explanations, over and above the matter of clarification of the Lahore resolution, in the hope of converting you as an individual "seeker."

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

XII

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH.

September 22, 1944.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Your letter of yesterday (21st inst), so disturbed me that I thought I would postpone my reply till after we had met at the usual time. Though I made no advance at our meeting, I think I see some what clearly what you are driving at. The more I think about the two nations theory the more alarming it appears to be. The book recommended by you gives me no help. It contains half-truths and its conclusions or inferences are unwarranted. I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The consequences of accepting such a

proposition are dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted there would be no limit to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin. I have, therefore, suggested a way out. Let it be a Partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be.

You seem to be averse to plebiscite. In spite of the admitted importance of the League, there must be clear proof that the people affected desire partition. In my opinion, all the people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on this single issue of division. Adult suffrage is the best method, but I would accept any other equivalent.

You summarily reject the idea of common interest between the two arms. I can be no willing party to a division which does not provide for the simultaneous safeguarding of common interest such as defence, foreign affairs and the like. There will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity.

Your letter shows a wide divergence of opinion and outlook between us. Thus you adhere to the opinion often expressed by you that the August 1942, resolution is "inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India." There is no proof for this sweeping statement.

We seem to be moving in a circle. I have made

a suggestion. If we are bent on agreeing, as I hope we are, let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

* * *

XIII

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI.

September 23, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 22, and I thank you for it. I am sorry that you think I have summarily rejected the idea of common interest between the two arms, and now you put it somewhat differently from 15 (b), when you say there will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity. My answer, already given, is that it will be for the constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan or any other party concerned, to deal with such matters on the footing of their being two independent States.

I am really surprised when you say there is no proof of what you characterize as a sweeping

statement of mine, that the August 1942, resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India. The resolution in its essence is as follows :

(a) immediate grant of complete Independence and setting up immediately of a federal Central Government on the basis of a united, democratic Government of India with federated units or provinces, which means establishing a Hindu Raj.

(b) that this National Government so set up will evolve a scheme for a constituent assembly, which will be chosen by adult franchise, which will prepare a constitution for the Government of India, which means that the constituent assembly chosen will be composed of an overwhelming majority of Hindus, nearly 75 per cent.

(c) to enforce this demand of the Congress the August resolution decides on and sanctions a resort to mass civil disobedience at your command and when ordered by you as the sole dictator of the Congress.

This demand is basically and fundamentally opposed to the ideals and demands of Muslim India of Pakistan, as embodied in the Lahore resolution, and to enforce such a demand by means of resort to mass civil disobedience is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India; and if you succeed in realizing this demand, it would be a death-blow to Muslim India, I see from the correspondence and talks between you and me that you are still holding fast to this fateful resolution.

From the very first day of our talks you made it clear to me, and you have repeatedly said in the course of our correspondence and talks, that you have approached me in your individual capacity, and you assured me that you were a seeker of light and knowledge and that you seriously and earnestly wanted to understand the Lahore resolution and were open to conviction and conversion. Therefore, in deference to your wishes, I made every effort all these days and in the course of our prolonged talks and correspondence to convert you, but unfortunately, it seems, I have failed. And now you have made new suggestions and proposals by your letter under relpy :

(1) You say : "I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be." I really do not know what this means, and I would like you to elaborate this proposal and give me some rough outlines of this new idea of yours as to how and when the division is to take place, and in what way it is different from the division envisaged by the Lahore resolution.

(2) You say : "Let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us." May I point out that you have repeatedly made clear to me that you are having these talks as an individual seeker? How can any question of a third party or parties to guide or arbitrate between us arise?

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

XIV

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH

September 23, 1944.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Last evening's talk has left a bad taste in the mouth. Our talks and our correspondence seem to run in parallel lines and never tough one another. We reached the breaking point last evening but, thank God, we were unwilling to part. We resumed discussion and suspended it in order to allow me to keep my time for the evening public prayer.

In order that all possible chance of making any mistake in a matter of this great importance may be removed, I would like you to give me in writing what precisely on your part you would want me to put my signature to.

I adhere to my suggestion that we may call in some outside assistance to help us at this stage.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

VX

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI

September 23, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 23, May I refer you to my letter of today's date which I sent to you in reply to yours of September 22? I have nothing new or fresh to add, but I may say that it is not a case of your being asked to put your signature as representing anybody till you clothe yourself with representative capacity and are vested with authority. We stand by, as I have already said, the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore resolution of March 1940. I appeal to you once more to revise your policy and programme, as the future of this subcontinent and the welfare of the peoples of India demand that you should face realities.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

XVI

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH.

September 24, 1944.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

I have your two letters of September 23, in reply to my letter of the 22nd and 23rd.

With your assistance I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement, so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied. You must therefore, have no apprehensions that the August resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement. That resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement.

I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the north-west zones, i.e. Baluchistan, Sind, North West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India.

Differing from you on the general basis, I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore of 1940, on my basis and on the following terms :

The areas should be demarcated by a Commission approved by the Congress and the League. The wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or through some equivalent method.

If the vote is in favour of separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate State as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can therefore be constituted into two sovereign independent States.

There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties.

The treaty shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two States.

Immediately on the acceptance of this agreement by the Congress and the League the two shall decide upon a common course of action for the attainment of independence of India.

The League will however be free to remain out of any direct action to which the Congress may regard and in which the League may not be willing to participate.

If you do not agree to these terms, could you let me know in precise terms what you would have me to accept in terms of the Lahore resolution and bind myself to recommend to the Congress? If you could kindly do this, I shall be able to see, apart from the difference in approach, what definite terms I can agree to. In your letter of September 23, you refer to "the basic and fundamental

principles embodied in the Lahore resolution" and ask me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when, as I feel, I have accepted the concrete consequence that should follow from such acceptance.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

* * *

XVII

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHI.

September 25, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 24, and I thank you for it. You have already rejected the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore resolution.

You do not accept that the Mussalmans of India are a nation.

You do not accept that the Mussalmans have an inherent right of self-determination.

You do not accept that they alone are entitled to exercise the right of self-determination.

You do not accept that Pakistan is composed of two zones, North-West and North-East, comprising six provinces, namely Sind, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, subject to territorial adjustments that may be agreed upon, as indicated in the Lahore resolution. The matter of demarcating and defining the territories can be taken up after the fundamentals above mentioned are accepted, and for that purpose machinery may be set up by agreement.

You do not accept the provisions embodied in the Lahore resolution for safeguarding the minorities, and yet in your letter under reply you say: "With your assistance, I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied," and proceed to say, "You must therefore have no apprehensions that the August resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement."

I have already clearly explained to you that the August resolution, so long as it stands, is bar, for it is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore resolution. You then proceed to say: "That resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain, and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement." I am not at present concerned with Britain, but the August resolution, as I have already stated is against the ideals and demands of the Muslim League. Further, there is the resolution of Jagat Narayan Lal, passed by the All-India Congress

Committee in May 1942, at Allahabad, which, in express terms, lays down as follow:

"The A.I.C.C. is of opinion that any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component State or territorial unit to secede from the Indian Union or Federation will be highly detrimental to the best interest of the people of the different States and provinces and the country as a whole and the Congress, therefore, cannot agree to any such proposal."

These two resolutions, so long as they stand, are a complete bar to any settlement on the basis of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan. It is open to the Congress to revise and modify them, but you are only speaking in your individual capacity, and even in that capacity you are holding fast to the August resolution, and you have given no indication of your attitude regarding Jagat Narayan Lal's resolution. I have repeatedly made it clear after we had discussed the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, as you maintained that, to use your own language, "Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore resolution out of shape and mutilated it but has given it substance and form," and proceeded to say: "Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji formula, I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement."

When I asked for further clarification, which you furnished me by your letter of September 15,

you started by saying: I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance I am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League," and thenceforward the Gandhi-Rajaji formula was not discussed any further, and the question of your representative character and authority which I had pointed out from the very commencement, therefore, did not arise, as you had given me the task of converting you to the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution, and ever since we discussed the Lahore resolution only at great length and examined the pros and cons, and finally you have rejected it.

As a result of our correspondence and discussions I find that the question of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan is only on your lips and it does not come from your heart, and suddenly at the eleventh hour you put forward a new suggestion, consisting only of two sentences, by your letter of September 22, saying: "I therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be." I naturally asked you what this new suggestion of yours meant, and wanted you to give me rough outlines of this new idea of yours as to how and when the division is to take place and in what way it is different from the division envisaged in the Lahore resolution, and now you have been good enough to give me your amplification, in your letter of September 24 under reply, in which you say: "Differing from you on the general basis I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim

League resolution of Lahore, 1940, on my basis and on the following terms." The terms clearly indicate that your basis is in vital conflict with, and is opposed to, the fundamental basis and principles of the Lahore resolution. Now let me take your main terms :

(a) "I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the north-west zones, i.e. Baluchistan, Sind, North-West Frontier Province and the part of Punjab where they are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India." If this term were accepted and given effect to, the present boundaries of these provinces would be maimed and mutilated beyond redemption and leave us only with the husk, and it is opposed to the Lahore resolution.

(b) That even in those mutilated areas so defined, the right of self-determination will not be exercised by the Muslims but by the inhabitants of those areas so demarcated. This again is opposed to the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution.

(c) That if the vote is in favour of separation they shall be allowed to "form a separate State as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination." Whereas we propose that we should come to a complete settlement of our own immediately, and by our united front and efforts do every-

thing in our power to secure the freedom and independence of the peoples of India on the basis of Pakistan and Hindustan.

(d) Next you say, "There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce, and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties." If these vital matters are to be administered by some Central authority, you do not indicate what sort of authority or machinery will be set up to administer these matters, and how and to whom again that authority will be responsible. According to the Lahore resolution, as I have already explained to you, all these matters, which are the lifeblood of any State, cannot be delegated to any Central authority or government. The matter of security of the two States and the natural and mutual obligations that may arise out of physical contiguity will be for the constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan, or other party concerned, to deal with on the footing of their being two independent States. As regards the safeguarding of the rights of minorities, I have already explained that this question of safeguarding the minorities is fully stated in the Lahore resolution.

You will, therefore, see that the entire basis of your new proposal is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore resolution, and as I have already pointed out to you, both in the correspondence and in our

discussions, it is very difficult for me to entertain proposals and negotiate and reach any agreement or settlement with you as an individual, unless they come from you in your representative capacity. That was the same difficulty with regard to the Gandhiji-Rajaji formula, and I made it clear to you at the very outset, but the formula was discussed as you asserted that it had met the Lahore resolution in substance, but while you were furnishing me with the clarification of this formula, you shunted it and we confined ourselves to the Lahore resolution, and hence the question of your representative capacity did not arise regarding this formula. But now you have, in your letter of September 24, made a new proposal of your own on your own basis, and the same difficulties present themselves to me as before, and it is difficult to deal with it any further unless it comes from you in your representative capacity.

I cannot agree with you when you finally wind up by saying: "In your letter of September 23, you refer to 'the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore resolution' and ask me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when, as I feel, I have accepted the concrete consequence that should follow from such acceptance". This is obviously far from correct. Why not then accept the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution and proceed to settle the details?

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

XVIII

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH

September 25, 1944.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Yesterday's talk leads me to inflict this letter on you which I trust you will not mind.

Our conversations have come about as a result of your correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula and your consultations with the League Working Committee thereon, and my own letter to you suggesting a meeting between you and me. My proposal of yesterday is an earnest effort to meet the essential requirements of the Lahore resolution. I would like you therefore, to think fifty times before throwing away an offer which has been made entirely in the spirit of service in the cause of communal harmony. Do not take, I pray, the responsibility of rejecting the offer. Throw it on your Council. Give me an opportunity of addressing them. If they feel like rejecting it, I would like you to advise the Council to put it before the open session of the League. If you will accept my advice and permit me I would attend the open session and address.

You are too technical when you dismiss my proposal for arbitration or outside guidance over points of difference. If I have approached you as

an individual, and not in any representative capacity, it is because we believe that if I reach an agreement with you it will be of material use in the process of securing a Congress—League settlement and acceptance of it by the country. Is it irrelevant or inadmissible to supplement our efforts to convince each other with outside help, guidance, advice or even arbitration?

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

* * *

XIX

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI

September 26, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 25. It is entirely incorrect and has no foundation in fact for you to say that our conversations have come about as a result of my correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula. It is equally baseless to say "and your consultations with the League Working Committee thereon." It was entirely in response to your letter of July 17, 1944, which I received while I was at Srinagar, with a fervent request on your part to meet you and you ended that letter by saying: "Do not disappoint me."

In my reply, again, from Srinagar, dated July 24, 1944, I intimated to you that I would be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which would probably be about the middle of August. This was long before the meeting of the Working Committee or that of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, and long before I reached Lahore, and when you arrived here and told me that you were approaching me in your individual capacity, I at once made it clear to you and informed you both in our talks and by letters, that the position you had taken up had no precedent for it, and further that it was not possible to negotiate and reach an agreement unless both the parties were fully represented; for it is one-sided business, as it will not be binding upon any organization in any sense whatever, but you would as an individual only recommend it, if any agreement is reached, to the Congress and the country, whereas it would be binding upon me as the President of the Muslim League, I cannot accept this position. I hope you do see the unfairness and the great disadvantage to me, and it is so simple and elementary for anyone to understand.

As regards your proposal of yesterday, which you have amplified in your letter of September 24, I have already sent you my reply.

With regard to your suggestion to be allowed to address the meeting of the Council, and if they feel like rejecting your "offer" the matter should be put before open session and should be allowed to address the open session, let me inform you that

only a member or delegate is entitled to participate in the deliberations of the meetings of the Council or in the open session, respectively. Besides it is a most extraordinary and unprecedented suggestion to make. However, I thank you for your advice.

As regards your proposal for arbitration and outside guidance, I have already replied to you, and it is not merely technically but a matter of substance. I fully reciprocate your desire of securing a Congress-League settlement.

However, I regret I have failed to convince you and convert you as I was hopeful of doing so.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

XX

GANDHIJI TO MR. JINNAH.

September 26, 1944.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

In view of my letter to you of yesterday, let to myself, I would have refrained from dealing with your letter before our meeting today. But

I have deferred to Rajaji's advice to finish the chain of correspondence.

I confess I am unable to understand your persistent refusal to appreciate the fact that the formula presented to you by me in my letter of the 24th, as well as the formula to you by Rajaji, gave you virtually what is embodied in the Lahore resolution, providing at the same time what is absolutely necessary to make the arrangement acceptable to the country. You keep on saying that I should accept certain thesis which you call the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore resolution, while I have been contending that the best way for us who differ in our approach to the problem is to give body to the demand as it stands in the resolution and work it out to our mutual satisfaction. It is on this plan that I understand Rajaji's formula to be conceived, and it is on the same plan that I have tried to work it out in the course of, and as a result of, our talks, I contend that either gives you the substance of the Lahore resolution. Unfortunately you reject both. And I cannot accept the Lahore resolution as you want me to, especially when you seek to introduce into its interpretation theories and claim which I cannot accept and which I cannot ever hope to induce India to accept.

Your constant references to my not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. I have approached you so that, if you and I can agree upon a common course of action, I may use what influence I possess for its acceptance

by the Congress and the country. If you break, it cannot be because I have no representative capacity or because I have been unwilling to give you satisfaction in regard to the claim embodied in the Lahore resolution.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

* * *

XXI

MR. JINNAH TO GANDHIJI

September 26, 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I have received your letter of September 26 and I note that you have written it with Rajaji's advice. Of course, it is for you to follow such advice as you may choose to do so, but I am only concerned for the moment with you. I note that at the last moment you have resurrected the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, although it was shunted all this time, and you proceed to say that this formula gives me virtually what is embodied in the Lahore resolution. You further say that on the same plan you have tried to formulate your latest proposals, as mentioned in your letter of September 24, and you maintain that either gives me the substance of the Lahore resolution. In your previous letter

you asserted that your formula gives me the "essence" of the Lahore resolution, I see a very close family resemblance between the two, and the substance of one or the other is practically the same, only it is put in different language, and I have already expressed my opinion that, in my judgment they neither meet the substance nor essence of the Lahore resolution. On the contrary, both are calculated completely to torpedo the Pakistan demand of Muslim India. I have never asked you to accept certain thesis, nor have I introduced any theories in the Lahore resolution. Thesis and theories are matters for scholars to indulge in.

I am sorry I have to repeat, but I am compelled to do so, that I cannot agree with you that my references to your not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. On the contrary, they have an important bearing, as I have already explained to you more than once. You again repeat that if I and you can agree upon a common course of action, you may use what influence you possess for its acceptance by the Congress and the country. I have already stated from the very beginning that is not enough, for the reasons I have already given. Your representative capacity comes into play when you are making counter-proposals, and I cannot understand how you can say that it is irrelevant. No responsible organization can entertain any proposal from any individual, however great he may be, unless it is backed up with the authority of a recognized organization and comes from its fully accredited representative. However, I need not labour this

point any more, as I have already explained it in our previous correspondence.

If a break comes, it will be because you have not satisfied me in regard to the essence of the claim embodied in the Lahore resolution. It is not a question of your being unwilling, but in fact it is so. If a break comes, it will be most unfortunate. If one does not agree with you or differs from you, you are always right and the other party is always wrong, and the next thing is that many are waiting prepared, in your circle, to pillory me when the word goes, but I must face all threats and consequences, and I can only act according to my judgment and conscience.

Unity Talks by Durlab Singh

Yours sincrely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

1947

On 6th June 1947, Mr. Gandhi made certain suggestions to Lord Mountbatten regarding referendum in North West Frontier etc. The text thereof was contained in the note of Mr. Ismay enclosed in the letter to Mr. Gandhi.

The Viceroy's House,
New Delhi,
7th June, 1947.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I enclose herewith a copy of a note that I have sent to the Viceroy, summarising the suggestions that you were good enought to put forward in the course of our talk yesterday evening.

I very much hope that I have interpreted your views rightly, but if you should find any mistakes, I should be so glad if you would let me know, in order that I may correct the copy that I have given to the Viceroy.

I so much enjoyed our talk.

Yours sincerely,

Ismay.

Mahatma Gandhi.

(Enclosure to the above)

1. North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Gandhi suggests that H.E. should speak to Mr. Jinnah in the following sense:

"I am extremely anxious lest the referendum in NWFP should lead to bloodshed and blood feuds between brother and brother pathan, and I have been wondering whether it could possibly be avoided. Now that you have got your Pakistan, would it not be wise for you to go to the NWFP and speak to the people of the Province of whatever

party they may be, including the present Ministry and their followers? You could explain what Pakistan, which has hitherto been a vague expression, really is, and present your case in an attractive manner, in the hope that you will be able to woo them to become a Province of Pakistan, with perfect freedom to frame their own Provincial constitution.

"If you are successful in your persuasion, the proposed referendum and all that it involves would be avoided. If you felt disposed to adopt this suggestion, I could, I think, give you a positive assurance that the Khan Brothers and their followers would meet you as friends and give you an attentive hearing."

Mr. Gandhi asked that if this appeal to Mr. Jinnah was unsuccessful, he (Mr. Gandhi) might be informed of the fact, in order that he might consider the position again. Mr. Gandhi added that Abdul Ghaffar Khan was so anxious about the permanent blood feuds which would result from the referendum, that he would go to almost any length, consistent with honour, to avoid it. In the last resort, he would be prepared to advise his brother and his colleagues in the Ministry to resign, and then to ask the Viceroy to put the NWFP under Section 93.

Mr. Gandhi emphasised that he had not discussed the above with his colleagues, and therefore, that it should not be mentioned to anyone at this stage.

2. Bengal and the Punjab.

Mr. Gandhi suggested that Mr. Jinnah should be advised to try to win over West Bengal and Eastern Punjab to Pakistan by the same methods.

3. Co-operation Between Mr. Jinnah and the Congress Leaders.

Mr. Gandhi suggested that H.E. the Viceroy should speak in the following sense to Mr. Jinnah, when he found him in the right mood to listen:

"I am here to help both parties to reach agreement in way that I can, and I regard this task not only as a pleasure, but as a duty. You must remember, however, that I cannot, in any event, be here forever. Now, therefore, that the decision has been made and you have your Pakistan, why do you not go yourself and talk with the Congress leaders as friends, and try to get a settlement between yourselves on all the various points at issue? This would make for a much better atmosphere than adhering to the practice of only meeting together under my chairmanship."

4. Agreements Between HMG and the two Indian Dominions.

Mr. Gandhi said that there was a lot of loose talk going about that HMG might have different agreements with Hindustan and Pakistan which would possibly tend to favour one over the other. It was, therefore, important that an announcement

should be made to the effect that it was HMG's wish either to enter into tri-partite arrangements with both the Dominions, or to have identical bi-lateral agreements with each of them: and that, in any event, there would be no question of differentiation.

On 10th June 1947, Lord Mountbatten wrote to Mr. Gandhi:

The Viceroy's House,
New Delhi,
10th June 1947.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

Thank you so much for the admirable suggestions which you handed to Lord Ismay. It is quite clear that Mr. Jinnah is very preoccupied at the present time, owing to the Muslim League meetings in Delhi, but I will, of course, take the earliest opportunity of mentioning to him the points you made.

I will do my best to convince him, but I hope you will not count too much on my intervention.

I think the idea in the fourth paragraph of your note is a good one, and I will follow it up with HMG. Perhaps the Prime Minister would give an assurance in debate in Parliament.

On 11th June 1947, Mr. Gandhi replied to Lord Mountbatten:

As to the referendum in the Frontier Province I must confess that my idea does not commend itself to Pandit Nehru and his colleagues. As I told you, if my proposal did not commend itself to them I would not have the heart to go any further with it.

This, however, does not in any way affect my proposal that before proceeding with the referendum, you should invite Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah to proceed to the Frontier Province and to woo the Ministers including Badshah Khan and his Khudai Khidmatgars who have made the Province what it is-better or worse. Before he goes, no doubt, he should be assured of a courteous hearing from them.

On 12th June 1947, Lord Mountbatten wrote to Mr. Gandhi:

I spoke to Mr. Jinnah along the lines that you asked me and he has authorised me to reply to you as follows.

2. Mr. Jinnah will gladly accept your suggestion that he should visit the Frontier and put the case of Pakistan to the leaders and people up there, provided you can obtain an undertaking from the Congress that they will not interfere.

3. He agrees with your view that by this means a referendum can be avoided and with it the risk of bloodshed removed.

4. I suggest that you should now communicate directly with him in this matter, as I am leaving for Simla to-morrow.

5. I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Jinnah.

Thereafter following letters were exchanged between Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Gandhi.

New Delhi,
13th June, 1947

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

His Excellency the Viceroy writes saying that 'you will gladly accept my suggestion and put the case of Pakistan to the leaders and the people there, provided I can obtain an undertaking from the Congress that they will not interfere.'

I do not know what you mean by the undertaking from the Congress that they will not interfere.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah,
10, Aurangzeb Road,
New Delhi.

GANDHI—JINNAH CORRESPONDENCE:

New Delhi,
13th June, 1947.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of 13th June and I thought it was quite clear what I meant that the Congress should undertake that they will not interfere with the people of the Frontier in any way whatsoever.

Yours sincerely,

M.A. Jinnah.

M. K. Gandhi, Esq.,
Bhangi Colony,
New Delhi.

New Delhi,
14th June, 1947.

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Yours of the 13th instant was received when I was at a meeting.

I had hoped that H.E. had not clearly understood your meaning. I now see that I was mistaken. I cannot ask the Congress to commit harakiri.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi.

Nandi Hill Station,
(Bangalore)
13th May, 1941.

Dear Sir Abdoola Haroon,

I have received your two letters of the 3rd May. Yes, it is very sad some of our Leaguers are easily moved and make ill-considered and irresponsible utterances and sometimes they are influenced by their immediate personal consideration. That should not dishearten us and specially a veteran like yourself.

I am very glad that Syed and others with your full support and co-operation are carrying on work of organizing the Mussalmans of Sind.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
21st January, 1942.

Dear Sir Abdullah,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th along with a copy of the memorandum submitted by you to His Excellency the Viceroy and I shall await the result.

Of course I have been watching the developments in Sind with very keen interest.

As regards my programme I can only tell you tentatively that I hope to be in Delhi in the first week of February and I have also accepted an engagement in Bengal to Preside over the conference of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League at Sirajganj on the 14th and 15th of February.

I fully realise that the situation in Sind is very appalling and unbearable, but the only course open to us is to organise our people as a disciplined nation and the other things must follow. It requires time and patience and strenuous and constant efforts. I feel confident that we shall come out successful in the end.

Hoping you are well, with kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

2nd February, 1941.

Dear Sir Abdoola,

Conflicting reports are appearing in the newspapers and I cannot understand the situation in Sind regarding the Ministry, I also had a talk with Mr. Yusuf and I hope that you will all stand together and abide by the understanding that was arrived at Karachi. (1) with regard to Mir Bande Ali's resignation I have not been able to ascertain what the agreement was. I understand from Mir Bande Ali that he was not bound to resign on the 15th of February, as he has not committed himself to do so.

If that is correct, in that case no question arises of anyone of the members of the Muslim League in the ministry resigning and the present ministry must continue and if the Congress or Hindus wish to break the ministry in order to get their man in, we must face the consequences, and let them break it. It will be far more honourable to sit on the opposition benches than to be dictated to by a few individuals.

(2) If Mir Bande Ali is bound to resign then Khuro and Shaikh Abdul Majid should also resign and if they cannot form the ministry without Mir Bande Ali, as what the Muslim League considers proper than let others form the ministry and we shall as honourable men, occupy the opposition benches.

If anyone merely for the sake of keeping his ministership tries to come to some other arrangement, the Council of the Sind Provincial Muslim League should declare publicly that, he does not represent the Muslim League and disciplinary action must be taken against him, for having acted in his individual capacity over the head of the Muslim League.

Please be firm and I am confident that the Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League will stand by it. Also please let me know as soon as possible, the correct position. I had fully discussed the matter with Shaikh Abdul Majid when he was in Bombay recently and he had agreed that this is the only honourable course for us to adopt.

Hoping you are well, with kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

DR. SIR MUHAMMAD IQBAL

In the Foreword to 'Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah', Quaid-i-Azam wrote: "I think these letters are of a great historical importance, particularly those which explain his views in clear and unambiguous terms on the political future of Muslim India. His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusions as a

result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as adumberated in the Lahore resolution of the All India Muslim League, popularly known as the "Pakistan Resolution." The booklet contains 13 letters written by Dr. Iqbal to Quaid-i-Azam between May 1936 to November 1937. Here are the two important letters—

Lahore,
28th May, 1937.

Confidential

My dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you so much for your letter which reached me in due course. I am glad to hear that you will bear in mind that I wrote to you about the changes in the constitution and programme of the League. I have no doubt that you fully realise the gravity of the situation as far as Muslim India is concerned. The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organisation which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim cannot attract our masses.

Under the new constitution the higher posts go to the sons of upper classes; the smaller ones go to the friends or relatives of the ministers. In other matters too our political institutions have

never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally. The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he belives that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question therefore is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League's activity to solve this question. If the League can give no such promises I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the Law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this system of Law is properly understood and applied, at last the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, e.g. N.W. India, Palestine may be repeated.

Also the insertion of Jawaharlal's socialism into the body-politic of Hinduism is likely to cause much bloodshed among the Hindus themselves. The issue between social democracy and Brahmanism is not dissimilar to the one between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Whether the fate of socialism will be the same as the fate of Buddhism in India I cannot say. But it is clear to my mind that if Hinduism accepts social democracy it must necessarily cease to the Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. The modern problems therefore, are far more easy to solve for the Muslims than for the Hindus. But as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve the problems it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Anyhow I have given you my own thoughts in the hope that you will give them serious consideration either in your address or in the discussion of the coming session of the League. Muslim India hopes that at this serious juncture your genius will discover some way out of our present difficulties.

Yours sincerely,

(Mohammad Iqbal)

Lahore,
June 21st, 1937.

Private and Confidential

My dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you so much for your letter which I I received yesterday. I know you are a busy man; but I do hope you won't mind my writing to you so often, as you are the only Muslim in India today to whom the community has a right to look up for safe guidance through the storm which is coming to North-West India, and perhaps to the whole of India. I tell you that we are actually living in a state of civil war which, but for the police and military, would become universal in no time. During the last few months there has been a series of Hindu-Muslim riots in India. In North-West India alone there have been at least three riots during the last three months and at least four cases of vilification of the prophet by Hindus and Sikhs. In each of these four cases, the vilifier has been murdered. There have also been cases of burning of the Koran in Sind. I have carefully studied the whole situation and believe that the real cause of these events is neither religious nor economic. It is purely political, i.e. the desire of the Sikhs and Hindus to intimidate Muslims even in the Muslim majority provinces. And the new constitution is such that even in the Muslim majority provinces, the Muslims are made entirely dependent on non-Muslims. The result is that the Muslim Ministry can take no proper action and are even driven to do

injustice to Muslims partly to please those on whom they depend, and partly to show that they are absolutely impartial. Thus it is clear that we have our specific reasons to reject this constitution. It seems to me that the new constitution is devised only to placate the Hindus. In the Hindu majority provinces, the Hindus have of course absolute majorities, and can ignore Muslims, altogether. In Muslim majority provinces, the Muslims are made entirely dependent on Hindus. I have no doubt in my mind that this constitution is calculated to do infinite harm to the Indian Muslims. Apart from this it is no solution of the economic problem which is so acute among Muslims.

The only thing that the communal award grants to Muslims is the recognition of their political existence in India. But such a recognition granted to a people whom this constitution does not and cannot help in solving their problem of poverty can be of no value to them. The Congress President has denied the political existence of Muslims in no unmistakable terms. The other Hindu political body, i.e. the Mahasabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. Many British statesmen also realise this, and the Hindu-Muslim riots which are rapidly coming in the wake of this constitution are sure further to open their eyes to the real situation in the country.

I remember, Lord Lothian told me before I left England that my scheme was the only possible solution of the troubles of India, but that it would take 25 years to come. Some Muslims in the Punjab are already suggesting the holding of a North-West India Muslim Conference, and the idea is rapidly spreading. I agree with you, however, that our community is not yet sufficiently organised and disciplined and perhaps the time for holding such a conference is not yet ripe. But I feel that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take.

To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?

Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present, to ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of both Muslim majority and minority provinces. It will therefore be better to hold the coming session of the League in the Punjab, and not in a Muslim minority province. The month of August is bad in Lahore.

I think you should seriously consider the advisability of holding the coming session at Lahore in the middle of October when the weather is quite good in Lahore. The interest in the All-India Muslim League is rapidly growing in the Punjab, and the holding of the coming session in Lahore is likely to give a fresh political awakening to the Punjab Muslims.

Yours sincerely,

Mohammad Iqbal
(Bar-at-Law).

Unfortunately Quaid-i-Azam's replies are not available. In the Foreword to the above booklet, Quaid-i-Azam explained: "It is, however, much to be regretted that my own replies to Iqbal are not available. During the period under reference I worked alone unassisted by the benefit of a personal staff and so did not retain duplicate copies of the numerous letters that I had to dispose of. I made enquiries from the Trustees of Iqbal's estate at Lahore and was informed that my letters are not traceable."

Dealing with "Jinnah—Iqbal Correspondence", in an article in the Pakistan Times (25th December, 1955) Muhammad Shafi wrote as follows:

It is a great pity that, not realising the great historical importance of the correspondence between these two savants, their letters were not preserved.

I, however, vividly remember that the letters of the Quaid-i-Azam to Allama Iqbal always contained a responsive note to the latter's suggestion regarding the destiny of the Indian Muslims. The only difference was that, being more practical, the Quaid-i-Azam did not ignore the real facts of the Muslim situation. He wanted to take his people with him and not to go too fast, and leave them far behind. After a careful examination and study of the constitutional problem facing India, Quaid-i-Azam had come to the same conclusion in 1937 as the one arrived at by Allama Iqbal namely partitioning of the country on religious, cultural and linguistic affinities. But he was reluctant to make a public commitment in this behalf before the opportune time. In one of his letters to the poet I remember Mr. Jinnah wrote as follows, "I fully agree with you that the political objective of the Indian Muslims must be stated clearly and unequivocally. But there are practical difficulties. Amongst the practical difficulties enumerated by him was the fact that "our people are politically unorganised, educationally backward and financially nowhere". Quaid-i-Azam added: "I want to pull them up step by step and before making them run I want to be sure that they are capable of standing on their own legs."

JAMIAT-UL-ULEMA

1944

In April 1944 Maulana Ahmad Saeed extended the invitation to Quaid-i-Azam to attend the annual

session of the Provincial Jamiat-ul-Ulema to be held at Delhi on May 26,27 and 28th.

Quaid-i-Azam replied—

"In my speech to the Muslim Students' Federation's address as well as in my concluding speech to the Muslim League Conference at Sialkot on April 30, I did appeal to every Musalman to join the League, including Jamiat and Ahrars. I would welcome every Muslaman to join the League and support its creed, policy and programme wholeheartedly and from within further improve our organisation and make it more efficient and better than it has been before.

"As regards the past talks and difference that may have existed for various reasons, I think it is not advisable to pursue them any more, but every Mussalman should bury the past and work for our goal of Pakistan for which we are carrying on this struggle.

"I regret that I am unable to accept your kind invitation to attend the annual session of the Provincial Jamiat-ul-Ulema at Delhi, as I think you know that it is after seven years that I have allowed myself a holiday for a short time, and I am here at Srinagar, and complete rest for a short time is absolutely necessary for me, but I would be very glad to meet you and your friends would care to do so, when I get to the plains some time in July."

JAMIAT-UL-ULEMA

1947

In April 1947 Maulana Hifzur Rahman, General Secretary, All-India Jamiat-ul-Ulema wrote to Quaid-i-Azam and suggested for a conference of All-Muslims Parties to evolve a common basis for the unity of Indian Muslims. He said: 'This was necessary in view of H.M.G's statement of February 20, to transfer power to Indian hands by June, 1948. According to Holy Quran without such consultation no decision of any Muslim Organisation, however, strong and representative it may be politically, can be entitled to be called a 'Sharai' or a lawful decision. The Jamiat would be ready to cooperate in any method of consultations suggested by you."

Quaid-i-Azam reply—

"In view of the new situation that has arisen by virtue of the White Paper published by the British Government on 20th February, 1947, and having regard to the grave issues which we have to face immediately, I agree with you that complete unity among the Musalmans is necessary, and I have emphasised that more than once, particularly, in the course of the last two or three weeks, and I have appealed to every Musalman to join the Muslim League.

"This is not the moment for us to raise any issues concerning domestic differences and it should

be for us to settle them as an organised body, according to new constitution and rules. This is not the moment for us to be involved to obtain the solution of our domestic problems when the external danger is facing us. I, therefore, most earnestly appeal to you to join the Muslim League without delay and make your contribution to Muslim national cause for the achievement of our cherished goal of Pakistan. That can only be done by unity amongst ourselves and by loyally supporting the Muslim League, which is the only authoritative representative organisation of Muslims of India.

"I have made it clear that any Muslim who is willing to join the League whatever may have been his views in the past, is welcome, and I would welcome everyone of the members of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind.

"I do hope that this will receive your earnest attention, as I really do not see any difficulty in the light of new development that have taken place and the attitude of the various important political Hindu organisations, in your responding to my appeal, as I note that you have emphasised and appreciated how important it is for us at this critical moment to stand together unitedly."

JAYAKAR—JINNAH

On 22nd May, 1925 Quaid-i-Azam wrote to Mr. M.R. Jayakar stating that there was an increase of the consensus of opinion that the time was ripe

for a common understanding between the different political parties with a view to united action and that he had informal discussions with several friends on the subject and there was a strong feeling in favour of co-ordinating their common efforts. Quaid-i-Azam had called a meeting of different leaders at his bungalow to which Mr. Jayakar was invited. In the letter was enclosed the following draft statement embodying his suggestions which had been tentatively made in this connection—

"Education, agitation and organisation are the essential pre-requisites for the successful prosecution of any national programme that will materially advance the cause of Swarajya. The suspension of the policy and programme of Non-co-operation by the Belgaum Congress, the crystallisation of the Sawarajists' policy into one of resistance of bureaucracy as it impedes progress to Swarajya and Das's speech at Faridpur eliminates the main obstacle to the reunion of all Nationalists on a common platform on the basis of a common programme. The only alternative to a thorough-going programme of non-co-operation is a programme of 'honourable co-operation. An analysis of the declaration of policy of the Swarajists, Independents and Liberals reveals the existence of much common ground between all the parties in regard to the main principles which will govern the national policy. The Congress has no political programme other than that of the Swaraj Party, while its constructive programme is not open to objection on principle on the part of any of the political parties. Self-reliance is the only basis on which national activities

can be organised. Co-ordination of activities within the Legislature and other public bodies and activities in the country is essential of the national will. There is agreement between the different parties on the need for a self-reliant basis in the formation of any programme and for the co-ordination of all common activities. Opinions however differ in the translation of these principles into action, but these differences are not fundamental in character. National interest demands the enunciation of a common policy that will offer a basis of all nationalists, irrespective of their party label. The education and organisation of the electorates, the organisation of an intensive and educative political campaign in India and abroad and the prosecution of broad-based constructive programme are matters in which all parties are effectively co-operated. A common policy is needed to render united action possible. Suggestions have been made that the Nationalists should join either the Swaraj Party or the Liberal Party as a step towards unity. In the view of many, the Congress alone as the greater body, offers a suitable medium for the union of all parties on a common platform. This can, however, be done only by the Congress participating directly in political activities, which function it has now delegated to the Swaraj Party. The yarn franchise also raises difficulties. In the circumstances, the immediate feasible course appears to be for the different parties to retain their individuality and to co-operate with one another to the extent a common programme permits united action, while continuing to make efforts to reunite all progressive sections of the people on the Congress platform. This can be

done by the Executive Committees of the different parties acting together or by the creation of a temporary organisation in which the progressive elements of all parties can come together.

Conditions in Bombay are favourable for a party co-operation between Nationalists, irrespective of party label as the basis of the common policy that we have enunciated. Serious difficulties present themselves in the organisation of all India on a similar basis. Under these circumstances, it is incumbent upon us all to make a beginning in Bombay towards the unity of all progressive sections of the people on a common platform. This can only be done by the temporary creation of a new organisation that will pledge itself to pursue common policy enunciated above while working at the same time for the unit of all parties on the Congress platform.

The creed of the new organisation shall be:

(1) The attainment of Swaraj.

(2) The immediate objective is the speedy attainment of full Dominion Status.

(3) The membership of the organisation shall be open to every adult of either sex over the age of 21, who subscribes to the creed and pays the prescribed subscription.

The programme shall be:

(1) A vigorous prosecution of a broad-based constructive programme through legislative and independent efforts.

(2) The co-ordination of activities within the Legislature and public bodies and activities in the country.

(3) The pursuit of a policy of "opposition or support of measures as national interests demand on a consideration of their intrinsic merits" in the Legislatures and public bodies.

(4) The organisation of the electorates.

(5) The organisation of an intensive educative political campaign in support of the policy enunciated above.

(6) Activities shall be confined to Bombay.

(7) The organisation shall consist of a President, two Vice-Presidents, Secretaries and an Executive Committee.

Mr. Jayakar in 'The Story of My Life' writes: "When I got this invitation I had great hopes that at least for the city of Bombay all Nationalists would combine and work the programme sketched out in the letter quoted above. Accordingly, more than

one conference was held with Jinnah. I personally supported Jinnah's idea of a new orientation of parties, but I found that the Swarajists' prejudices against him and their strict adherence to the very letter of their programme prevented the formation of what Jinnah called a new organisation. After several attempts at his residence and mine, ultimately, the attempt was given up. It was revived, as the subsequent pages will show, once more in New Delhi on the advent of the Simon's Commission and there too an attempt to formulate a new inclusive organisation failed. The Swarajists' strong faith in their own programme and their unwillingness to make changes in the same interfered with the success of Jinnah's efforts. If this had been accomplished, the country would have been a strong Nationalist Party working for a common prgramme in which leading Swarajists like Motilal and Das and leading Nationalists like Jinnah would have co-operated, but the thing was not to be and the attempt failed.

* * *

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay,

January 11, 1940.

Dear Khaliq,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 8th January. I am glad you appreciate the unreasonable attitude taken up by the Congress as disclosed by the recent correspondence between Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

and myself. Well, we have to face the situation as best we can.

As regards the question of my appealing to the Mussalmans for funds for relief of the Anatolian calamity, the matter is receiving my consideration, and I hope to be able to decide it within a few days. The trouble is who is to be responsible for collecting the funds, otherwise, of course, naturally I am wholeheartedly in favour of doing all we can to help the Turkish people.

With regard to the last matter referred to in your letter regarding the correspondence between the Viceroy and myself, I have already decided to place the matter before the Working Committee before its publication, and I have written to Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan to call, if possible, a meeting of the Working Committee about the end of this month. I hope that you will make it a point to attend it.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah.

Chowdhary Khaliquzzaman Esq.,
Lucknow.

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay
9th August, 1940.

Dear Khaliquzzaman,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th July as well as of the 7th August and thank you for all

the information that you have placed at my disposal. I could not reply to your letter of the 9th July, as I was not well, and besides, important events have been moving very fast and had occupied all my time.

You must have heard by now about the meeting of the Working Committee in Bombay on the 17th.

As regards the machinations of certain persons in Punjab I thank you for all the information. I shall place before you all things when you are in Bombay. The various points suggested by you will certainly have my very close attention and more when we meet in Bombay as I hope you will attend this very important meeting without fail.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Ch. Khaliquzzaman.

* * *

ABDUS SATTAR KHEIRI

23rd May, 1938.

My dear Mr. Jinnah,

It is only with the purpose of strengthening your hands that I am writing this to you. We, here in Aligarh, have the fullest faith in YOU. We feel that the interests of not only 90,000,000 Indian Muslims are secure in your hands but also those of

the generations to come. BUT it is rather disquieting to hear that pressure is being brought on you to bring about an understanding at any cost, provided some selfish members may be able to get a few big jobs.

Such a move shall be catastrophal at this stage when the Muslims are on the way to solidarity and organisation. The most fundamental fact and right that the 90,000,000 of Indian Muslims are in THEMSELVES A GREAT NATION and A SEPARATE POLITICAL ENTITY must not be sacrificed. If the Congress Hindus are made to recognise this, then every other thing not inconsistent with this is a minor thing.

Such a demand is not even in modern history and current politics a new thing. According to the Peace Treaty of St. Germain in 1919, the great DEMOCRATIC powers of the world (England, France, U.S) created a DEMOCRATIC state, Czecho-Slovakia and granted to the Germans and the Slovaks equal rights with the Czechs. The Czechs were also signitories to the treaty. The Germans, for instance, in it, were granted to have their own schools, their own courts and judges and equal share in the government of the land. A sort of full autonomy, as in Switzerland, was promised to them. Of course the promises were not kept. The oppression continued till their brothers on the other side of the borders became strong etc., etc.

The Muslims have been now aroused. The

spirit which you have breathed into them is now a matter of fact and cannot be ignored.

I know, we are still disorganised, and the temptation is great to have a respite. Please do not yield to any kind of pressure. Act only according to your inner political self.

I pray that God shall give you strength in this great trial and true insight into the needs of the Indian Muslims.

Yours sincerely,

Sattar Kheiri
A member of the League.

Bhopal,

18th September, 1938.

Dear Mr. Sattar Kheiri,

I thank you for your letter of the 8th August 1938 and I am sorry I was not able to reply to your letter because I was not well. I thank you for the paper called "The Spirit of the Time." I read it with interest and it is very good of you of promise to send me its copy regularly.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

District Jail, Dehra Dun (U.P.)
Tuesday, August 12, 1941. 8 P.M.

My dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have the fullest trust in your leadership. Only a fool would not see what position the Muslim League has gained during the last three years. We have been always advancing and that too quite rapidly, in spite of the kind of following you have had. That is his last speech, Mr. Amery speaks of insuperable objections to such an scheme as the so-called Pakistan scheme, at any rate in its extreme form, I find rather encouraging. There are still much more encouraging statements in his speech. He finally seems to dismiss the English parliamentary system as unsuitable for India. Then he seems to be positive that the Congress is never likely to enjoy such a powerful position in the Government of India as they would have enjoyed in the now dead constitution. But there is no finality in politics. Mr. Amery or Mr. Churchill or any body else is not going to fight our battles. We alone must solve our problems. Under your leadership, we hope we will do.

Muslim University

In the monthly, "Palestine and Middle East" of January 1, 1941, on page 13, there is an article on the Hebrew University and War. It begins as follows: "When the Hebrew University was projected it was conceived not only as the centre of Jewish learning but equally as an institution which

would grapple with the manifold scientific problems confronting the development of the Jewish National Home............"

And we know what part the Hebrew University has been playing in the realization of the political aspiration on the Jewish Nation. And yet, Mr. Jinnah, excluding your personal interest, which I appreciate fully, the Muslim League as an organization has been criminally neglecting this source of all real power. Nay the Leaders of the U.P. Muslim League have served as the Fifth Column of the Congress, and unknowingly as the agents of the anti-religious Communistics—International. I take all the responsibility of making this bold statement on me. It is an irrefutable fact that Nawab Ismail Khan, the President of the U.P. League, Choudhri Khaliquzzaman, the Leader of the Muslim League party in the U.P. Assembly and our popular Leader Raja Sahib Mahmudabad and some other living or now dead, brought by canvassing and by their own votes into the Muslim University Court of a Congress Muslim M.L.A.'s from various provisional and Central Assemblies, because they thought these Congress Muslims will cast their votes against Dr. Sir Ziauddin. Mr. Jinnah you remember, three years ago both Dr. Ziauddin and Nawab Ismail Khan at your advice withdrew their names from being candidates for the Vice-Chancellorship. I have heard from a big Congress Leader, though just now I have forgotten his name, that Pandit Vallabh Pant was angry with Nawab Ismail Khan on account of withdrawing his name, for Mr. Pant had made all arrangements

for leave etc. for such members of the University Court who were to vote for the Nawab Sahib. Nawab Ismail Khan has been the greatest supporter of Dr. Zakir of the Jamia Millia, who had been doing his best to introduce Congress minded members in the Staff and the Court. Another great friend of Nawab Sahib has been Khan Bhadur Deputy Habibullah, the bitterer enemy of all League workers in the University. About this Dr. Abid, Mr. Jamiluddin Ahmed and myself protested once to Nawab Sahib. So far once he stayed at Dr. Abid's when he came on League business. And once we three and a few other spoke to Nawab Sahib about Dr. Zakir. Upon this Nawab lost all self control and was full of rage. And now the thing has been exposed. They have been the cause of party feeling in the University. For years they have been intriguing to bring in Congress-Walas in the key-positions in the University. It were these three persons who had brought in the Executive Council of the University men like Tasadduq Ahmed Sherwani, Abdul Majid Khwaja, Khwaja Abdul Hameed of Okasa fame. And now when everything is out and when they find that in spite of all their intrigues and let me say boldly, their treachery to Islam they have lost the power they had been wielding so long, they have at last resigned from the membership of the Executive Council of the University.

Members of the Muslim League in the University, its Officials and I regard the election of Dr. Ziauddin as the greatest victory of the Muslim League and this against the grim opposition of the

U.P. Muslim League. Does it not look like an anomaly?

In to-day's Statesman I read, "This University is a Moslem institution which has preserved an Islamic atmosphere and respect for Islamic tenets. For those who oppose and undermine Islamic beliefs and practices in addressing the students of the Muslim Universities are open. "Declared Sir Ziauddin Ahmed, Vice-Chancellor, in addressing the students of the Muslim University, Aligarh, at the beginning of the new session to-day. ...." But these will remain in words uttered into the the air to be lost unless someone who is energetic, enthusiastic and capable takes them up and sees that the Dr. sticks to them. Instead, I am sure, there will be lots of energetic opposition to him.

I know, we are still disorganised and the temptation is very great to have a respite. Please do not yield to any kind of pressure. Act only according to your inner political self. All you have been telling us shows that your inner political self is very sound and is very fully *Islamic*.

I pray that God shall give you strength in this great hour of trial and true insight into the needs of the Indian Muslims.

Very sincerely yours,

Sattar Kheiri.
A member of the League's Council.

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill.
27th August, 1941.

Dear Mr. Khairi,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 12th of August, and thank you for it. The various suggestions that you have made will certainly receive my careful consideration.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

Muhmd. Abdus Sattar Kheiri,
Muslim University, Aligarh(U.P)
Sunday October 29, 1944 10.20 A.M.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Peace. It is just to inform you that I have come back to Aligarh and I thank you heartily for all you did for my release during the early days of my detention. No one's efforts succeeded because Allah had planned for me. I know that even the Government could not release me though they tried more than once. But when the hour came they could not keep me a day longer. I used to write to you from the Jail but in the Parole Camp

at Naini Tal I was told not to write to political personalities. I did not even need then to write. My faith in you by that time had grown so strong that I could call you "AMEEN". I was never disappointed in all what you said or did. In fact almost always I felt what your reaction to such and such a matter would be and I was always right.

What I feel and know and I am sure that you feel and know still more that we so-called Muslims lack Islamic character and without it nothing Islamic can be done. To-day is the first time I am writing any letter after my release. Mr. Jinnah I had unique opportunities to mediate, think and plan in jail and in the camp. I have not wasted my time. And when I feel to work, I feel twenty years younger. I am sure that Pakistan will come but only then when we depend for our success only on Allah and on our own strength bestowed to us by Allah. And this time is bound to come. Pakistan shall be achieved by the efforts of truly honest and sincere Muslims howmuchsoever unpleasant disagreeable and abhorent it may be to others. I have faith in Allah, I have faith in you and I have faith in myself.

Then I have work before me I am healthy, strong and young. I hope that you too are keeping good health and are feeling younger and younger. God may preserve you for the work to be done.

Yours sincerely,

Sattar Kheiri.

10, Aurangzeb Road,
New Delhi,
8th November, 1944.

My dear Mr. Kheiri,

I am in receipt of your letter of October 29th, and I thank you for it. I am glad that you are a free man. Of course, I do not know why you were subjected to detention, but you know that I am always against any man's liberty being taken away without a judicial trial.

I am glad that you are well and full of hopes, and that you will work for the betterment of Muslim India. I know we have many difficulties, but I think we have made a tremendous progress, and we have every reason to be encouraged, having regard to the enthusiastic support and sympathy we have of millions of our people. If we work in an organized and united spirit, I am confident that we shall achieve our goal of Pakistan.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

SIR KHIZER HAYAT KHAN TIWANA & JINNAH

On 27th, April 1944, Quaid-i-Azam issued the statement on the breakdown of his talks with Khizar Hayat Khan Tiwana. He said:

"We have had prolonged discussions; and since my arrival here for the second time, in continuation of our previous discussions which started as far back as March 19, I met Malik Khizar Hayat Khan on April 20, and he has discussed the matter with me during half a dozen interviews lasting over two hours or three hours on each occasion, and he had promised to give me his final reply today.

"He arrived at my house this afternoon. When I asked him what was his final attitude and that of Sir Chhotu Ram and Sardar Baldev Singh regarding the proposals which I had placed before him and them was, he then verbally told me many things, and I suggested that in fairness to him and me it is better that he should give me the final reply in writing, so that there should be no room for any misunderstanding. Accordingly, when he was here I dictated a letter to my private secretary. It was typed and handed over to him on the understanding that he will let me have his final reply in writing by 9 o'clock tonight, as I made it clear to him that we had discussed the whole question threadbare, and that it was not possible for me to wait any longer, specially as I was booked to leave for Sialkot tomorrow.

"He promised to let me have his reply by 9 o'clock tonight. I waited for the reply and at 9.20 p.m. I rang him up saying that I had not received from him the promised reply in writing.

Much to my surprise on telphone he informed me that he had no reply to give except what he had told me verbally.

Thereupon I sent him a letter, same date, after this telephonic conversation between him and me at about 9.30 p.m. I sent this letter with a responsible person to make sure that it was delivered to him. When he went there Malik Khizer Hayat Khan declined to acknowledge even the receipt of the letter on a slip of paper which was sent along with the letter.

"I had again to send Nawab of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, and Mumtaz Daultana, M.L.A., with the letter and the slip on which he was requested to acknowledge the receipt, but he again declined to sign the receipt and receive the letter. I had to send them a second time to deliver the letter personally to Malik Khizer Hayat Khan, and endorse upon that acknowledgment slip that they had in fact delivered the letter personally to him. This was on April 27 at 11 p.m. and their endorsement runs as follows:"

"We have personally delivered this letter to Malik Khizer Hayat Khan on April 27, at 11 p.m. and he refuses to acknowledge receipt of it. Therefore, we hereby state that we have in fact delivered the letter to him personally and certify to that effect.

Iftikhar Hussain Khan,
Mumtaz Daultana.

Malik Khizer Hayat Khan has neither answered my first letter of April 27, which was delivered to him personally today, nor my second letter of which he refused to acknowledge the receipt giving

final reply in writing as to what Sir Chhotu Ram, Sardar Baldev Singh and he himself had to say with regard to the proposals of ours, which now had been the subject-matter of discussion since my arrival in Lahore and had been discussed threadbare.

As Malik Khizer Hayat has not replied to me yet-00.30 hours-it is now for the Muslim League to decide what course of action they should take.

The following letter was personally delivered by Quaid-i-Azam to Khizer Hayat.

Dear Malik Khizer Hayat Khan,

We have had prolonged discussions, and I shall feel obliged if you will be good enough to let me know your final decision with regard to the three points

Please let me know to what extent Sir Chhotu Ram and Sardar Baldev Singh agree with all these three proposals or any of them, and also whether you agree with all these three proposals or any of them. I hope that you will let me have your reply by this evening as it is not possible to wait any longer.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

The following letter was addressed by Quaid-i-Azam to Khizer Hayat which the Nawab of Mamdot and Mr. Mumtaz Daultana went to deliver to him.

Dear Malik Khizer Hayat Khan,

You promised to send me your reply to my letter dated April 27, which was given to you this afternoon, by 9 o'clock at the latest tonight and I waited for it and rang you up that I was waiting for a reply because it was nearly 9.20 p.m. I received an answer from you that you have no reply to give except what you told me verbally. That is going back on your promise to give me your reply in writing. You said so many things verbally to me that it was impossible to know what your position was.

I once more request you to give me your reply in writing, and if I do not hear from you immediately in reply to this letter I shall conclude that you do not accept the three proposals or any of them that were made in my letter; and in view of this the Muslim League now will have to decide as to what course of action they should adopt.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

DR. LATIF.

T e l e g r a m

Dated: 9-10-1940.

M. .A. Jinnah, Esquire,
Malabar Hill, Bombay,

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu writes me asking immediate reply, Letter begins:

"As you are aware your cultural zones scheme together Alternative Constitution suggested by you have received careful attention from some prominent Congress leaders (stop) Should further elucidation be necessary regard few points in your Constitution would it be possible for you meet leading Members Working Committee for personal discussion (stop) It would be of course purely in your individual capacity as Author Scheme and Constitution without prejudice and for purpose elucidation of issues that might lead to an agreed solution (stop) As I am leaving tomorrow night tenth for Wardha please send me immediate reply (stop) Letter ends. Kindly wire if you have any objection my meeting Congress Leaders personal capacity for elucidation."

Latif.

Adikmet,
Hyderabad (Dn.)

R e p l y

Dated 9-10-1940.

Dr. Latif,

Adikmet, Hyderabad-Deccan.

Your telegram regret cannot agree meeting Congress Working Committee any Congress Hindu leader welcomed see me.

Jinnah.

Yusuf Manzil, Adikmet,
Hyderabad—Deccan,
10th October, 1940.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have received your telegram saying that you do not agree that I should 'meet any member of the Congress Working Committee,' and that 'any Hindu Congress leader is welcomed to see you.'

My telegram to you conveying the contents of Mrs. Sarojini Naidu's letter to which the above was your reply probably was not clear in its meaning. I enclose a full copy of her letter.

The letter makes it clear that it was in my individual capacity as Author of an 'Alternative Constitution', and without prejudicing the official position of any party, that I was required to say

whether it was possible for me to meet one or two members of the Congress Working Committee and elucidate a few points in the proposed Constitution. That being so, there is obviously no ground for me to refuse to dicuss it when invited to do so, especially when the scheme claims to have been prepared for the consideration not merely of the Muslim League but of all other political parties in the land.

As you are aware, I have discussed the subject during the last one year and a half with political thinkers belonging to every camp. But neither I nor any of those with whom I have had to discuss it, have ever been in doubt about my personal role or felt that I was sponsoring the official views of the Muslim League, although everyone would see that as a Muslim my sympathies were always in favour of the Muslim League. My attitude has all along been that of a student anxious to explain a thesis to all concerned - a thesis in which I have fervently believed. In none of my writings have I ever, even unwittingly, compromised the official position of the Muslim League. In fact, I have had oft and on to attempt to bring round the leaders of the League to my way of thinking; and I cannot say to myself that my attempts have always met with full success. Even as recently as the 27th September, I had to take up so much of your time in Delhi in trying to impress upon you that your Resolution of Lahore lacked background and that its provisions, particularly the provision of mandatory safeguards for Muslim minorities, needed to be fitted into an All-India framework. Such being my

personal view of the League's latest official programme, I should be the last person to have compromised the official position of the League in the course of any discussion of my own scheme with anyone.

The object of my telegram to you was to find out if you, as an experienced leader enjoying my personal profound respect, would give any word of caution or advice in respect of the discussion I might have with any leading members of the Congress Working Committee. Your reply, therefore, is rather unexpected. You have asked me not to meet them at all. Of course, my meeting any one depends upon my convenience. But as Author of the Scheme, how can I refuse to discuss it when asked to do so. That would look very ridiculous and would be against the very spirit of the Scheme itself. I would have been certainly different if my scheme had been adopted by the Muslim League in its fulness, in which case I would have left its interpretation or exposition entirely to the official representatives of the League.

I pray you, therefore, to think over the matter. For the present I have given no reply to Mrs. Naidu, because it would surprise her, as it would anybody, if I should tell her that as author of an idea I could not see my way to explain it to those who seek to understand it. I shall, therefore, be happy to know that you never meant in your telegram that I should give such a reply to her.

Yours sincerely,

S. A. Latif.

M. A. Jinnah, Esqr., Bar-at-Law,
Malabar Hill, Bombay.

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay,

Dated 12th October, 1940.

Dear Dr. Latif,

I have received your letter of the 10th of October, 1940, with a copy of the letter addressed to you by Mrs. Sarojini Naidu.

So far as I am concerned there is no misunderstanding of any kind whatsoever. It is quite clear and I am still of opinion that having regard to the position you occupy you should not wait on any member of the Congress Working Committee for the ostensible purpose suggested. If they really desire to discuss with you as the author of a scheme in your individual capacity for the purpose of elucidation, why all this fuss? They can do so by meeting you at your place, or by correspondence. But let me draw your attention to the last sentence of the first paragraph of the letter of Mrs. Naidu. It runs as follows:

> It would be of course purely in your individual capacity as author of the scheme and constitution without prejudice and for the purpose of clarification of issues that might lead to an agreed solution.

What does this mean? Agreed solution between whom?

Besides, in my opinion, your scheme is fundamentally different from the basic principle laid down in the Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League, last March.

I am sorry that you do not quite appreciate the League Resolution, although I tried to explain to you in our talk on the 27th of September. You say, to use your own words, "The object of my telegram to you was to find out if you, as an experienced leader enjoying my personal profound respect, would give any word of caution or advice in respect of the discussion I might have with any leading member of the Congress Working Committee." That is the very reason why I advised you not to be dragged into this move as you are sought to be. I still advise you to adhere to my request contained in my telegram.

We did not have sufficient time to discuss the Lahore Resolution in Delhi, as I was busy with the meeting of the Working Committee, but I shall be too glad to resume our talk in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Dr. S. A. Latif,
Hyderabad.

Yusuf Manzil, Adikmet,
Hyderabad—Deccan,
17th October, 1940.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I received your letter last evening and wired to you as under:

"I appreciate your standpoint. Will follow advice."

Mrs. Naidu has come back from Wardha and I had a talk with her to-day on the phone in connection with her letter under consideration. I told her my view, and she said that in that case, her friends on the Congress Working Committee would write to me and seek elucidation of certain points in my constitutional scheme. Let the matter rest at that. When I actually hear from them, I shall write to you again.

As I told you in Delhi, I was practically in full agreement with the Lahore Resolution as far as it went. But I tried to make it clear that when you would proceed to implement it, you would have to reproduce in some form the All-India background provided in my scheme.

The Resolution provides for two compact Federated Sovereign States-one on the North-West,

and the other on the North-East-even as envisaged in my alternative constitution which has been under your consideration for over a year. It too speaks of safeguards to be provided in the constitution for Muslims in areas where they are in the minority. Only my scheme details those safeguards. My contention is that the provisions for minorities ("mandatory" as the Resolution qualifies them) will argue some reciprocal All-India arrangement such as can be effectively enforced. Indeed the Resolution states that for some time to come at least, the exercise of powers in respect of Defence, External relations, Custom, Communications, etc., will not be assumed by the States you would carve out. In other words, the Resolution anticipates a a transitional All-India Constitution at least for these subjects. That is one of the reasons why I have provided a Centre-a Centre which should be agreeable to you and from where the Hindus will not be in a position to dominate the Muslims. (Vide the provisions in this respect under Representation on Legislature (3) and Executive (2), pages 3 and 4 of the proposed constitution as redrafted three months ago with a view to implementing the Lahore Resolution and forwarded to Sir Abdullah Haroon for the consideration of his Constitution Committee (Copy enclosed).

I do not think, therefore, that my scheme is "fundamentally different from the basic principle laid down in the Lahore Resolution" as you say. If there is really any difference, it is in this. Mine is fully outlined; yours is only partially disclosed,

though standing on all fours with it, for all intents and purposes.

But if my interpretation is not correct, and your view is that the scheme does not at all need any Centre or an all-India background to set against for implementing its provisions, and that it can stand on its own legs, then it is clear that I must endeavour to understand how all that is possible, particularly in view of the fact that I have to preside over the Ceded Districts Muslim Conference in the Presidency of Madras next month and discuss in my address the implications of the Lahore Resolution as they affect the Muslims in areas where they are in the minority-the very purpose for which the Conference has been convened. I welcome, therefore, your suggestion to resume our talk on the subject in the near future. It may be possible for me to come to Bombay in the last week of this month. Will that suit you?

With deep regards,

Yours sincerely,

S. A. Latif.

* * *

M. A. Jinnah, Esqr.,
Bar-at-Law,
Malabar Hill, Bombay.

Readymoney Lodge,
Matheran,
21st October, 1940.

Dear Dr. Latif,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 17th of

October, and I shall be glad to see you in Bombay. But I shall be there only for two or three days. It will, therefore, be better if you come and see me at Delhi on or after the 5th of November.

As regards the other matters I do not think I need discuss them till we meet.

Yours Sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

Dr. S. A. Latif.

Yusuf Manzil, Adikmet,
Hyderabad—Deccan,
24th October, 1940.

Dear Mr. Jinnah.

I am in receipt of your letter dated 21st October. I agree with you that it would be better if I see you at Delhi after the 5th November. I shall try to be there before the 10th.

Yours Sincerely,

S. A. Latif.

M. A. Jinnah, Esquire,
Bar-at-Law,
Malabar Hill, Bombay.

LORD LINLITHGOW

Linlithgow's letter to Jinnah Disclosed.

You will remember that you wrote to me on the 29th May, to send me a copy of a letter which you had received from the Mufti of Palestine on which you asked my consideration. I am sorry not to have been able to let you have an earlier answer but as you will understand I have had to ascertain the position from H.M.G.

NO RELATIONS WITH MUFTI

I should, I think, make it clear in the first place that H.M.G. have no relations with the Mufti, who will not be permitted to return to Palestine, and that the answer which follows is accordingly made in confidence and should not be passed on to the Mufti.

The Mufti has throughout his career shown himself to be unalterably opposed to British administration in Palestine. He must, I fear, be regarded as primarily responsible for the recent campaign of assassination and terrorism and in spite of notable efforts made to meet Arab claims by the policy set out in the White Paper he has in no degree modified his attitude, but, on the contrary, has, under enemy influence, become the focus of

hostile activity and intrigue in the Middle East against the British Government and the Allied cause.

Outbreak of war

In these circumstances you will no doubt accept with great reserve statements emanating from such a source. The fact is that the publication of the White Paper produced an immediate detente in Palestine, since the Arabs realised that it went far to meet their claims, and, with the outbreak of the war, which was the occasion for widespread demonstrations of support for the Allied cause from the Arab community, progress towards the restoration of normal conditions in the country has been continuous. So great indeed has been the improvement in the situation that the military authorities in Palestine have been able to review sentences of offences committed during the disturbances and to release many who had been placed under detention.

As recently as June 15, you will be glad to know, the emergency regulations were amended to provide that military courts should not have power to impose death sentences, and to remove from their competence any case in which the offences had been committed before that date. It is hoped that circumstances will permit of further gradual relaxation of the drastic measures imposed during the disturbances.

ARAB RIGHTS ASSURED

Finally, I would invite your attention to the measures so far taken to implement the policy laid down in the White Paper of May, 1939, V.S., regulation of Jewish immigration since April, 1939, in accordance with the provisions of the White Paper, and the enactment of legislation last February, with which you will be familiar from the references in the public press, and which was embodied in command paper 6,180 controlling the transfer of land in the interests of Arab agriculturists. You may rest assured that every consideration has been and will continue to be given by H.M.G. to legitimate Arab claims.

Yours Sincerely,

Linlithgow.

* * * * *

RAMSAY MACDONALD

June 19, 1929.

To,

Ramsay MacDonald,
Prime Minister.

Dear Mr. MacDonald,

Further, you know in the recent publication of the memoirs of Lord Curzon, I think, it was discovered that there was some difference of opinion as to the significance of the words which were finally adopted in the declaration of August, 1917 between Lord Curzon and Mr. Montagu. Along with this the policy of the Government of India and His Majistey's Government since 1924 in turning a deaf ear to all reasonable demands had led almost every political party to come to the conclusion that there is no hope of getting any fairplay and thus there is a section in India that has already declared in favour of complete independence, and I may tell you without exaggeration that the movement for independence is gaining ground, as it is supported by the Indian National Congress.

This being a short summary of the position, I would most earnestly urge upon you at this moment to persuade His Majesty's Government without delay to make a declaration that Great Britain is unequivocally pledged to the policy of granting to India full responsible Government with Dominion status. The effect of such a declaration will be very far-reaching and go a great way to create a different atmosphere in the country and will be a

very severe antidote to the movement for independence. But, here again, I must admit, in the words of the Viceroy, that we must not forget that actions are held more powerful than words. Naturally, therefore, the next question that presents itself to all thinking men is what action or actions should be taken, and may I quote again from the same speech of Lord Irwin. That is what he says:

> 'It would seem evident, however, that what all people must desire is a solution reached by mutual agreement between Great Britain and India, and that, in the present circumstances, the friendly collaboration of Great Britain and India is a requisite and indispensable condition to obtain it. On the one side it is as unprofitable to deny the right to Parliament to form its free and deliberate judgment on the problems as it would be short-sighted of Parliament to underrate the importance of trying to reach a solution which might carry the willing assent of political India.'

May I suggest a solution, which I think would most probably be acceptable to India. His Majesty's Government before they formulate their proposals and after they are in receipt of the Simon Commission Report and the views of the Government of India, and so, before they formulate their proposals, should invite representatives of India, who would be in a position to deliver the goods, (because completely unanimous opinion in India is not possible at present) to sit in conference with

them with a view to reaching a solution which might carry, to use the words of the Viceroy, the 'willing assent of the political India.' If such an invitation comes directly from the Prime Minister on behalf of His Majesty's Government, I feel that it will be irresistible, and if such a conference is held with men who are in the front and the foremost rank of political India, I am not unhopeful that a solution may be reached satisfactory to Great Britain and India.

Will you, therefore, consider these proposals of mine with the care and attention that you can give them. In short it comes to this (1) declaration of policy, (2) followed up with an invitation from His Majesty's Government with a view to arriving at an agreement as to the future constitution of India before His Majesty's Government formulate any definite proposals and place them before Parliament. His Majesty's Government will be, as I have said before, armed already with the Simon Report and the Government of India dispatch on it, both of them, I assume, will not be satisfactory.

As to the personnel of the representatives of India to be invited you may well ask me by what method are we to get them. I have very carefully considered the pros and cons and I have come to the conclusion that if we are to elect our representatives in the Assembly and confine ourselves to the members of the Assembly, there are men outside the Assembly whose presence would be indispensable for a conference of the kind I am contemplating.

On the other hand, if it is thrown open to non-members, it might lead to a great deal of canvassing and rivalry and we may not get the personnel we may desire. I think you yourself are fairly well acquainted with the names of prominent political leaders in India. But besides that His Excellency the Viceroy, I think, by now knows pretty well who is who in the political world of India and further the members of the Government of India would be able to guide you, if necessary. But you must take upon yourself to invite such men as you may be advised to go over to London and confer with His Majesty's Government and sit in conference with the Cabinet. Of course, the number should be, as far as possible, not very large. I should restrict the number to about fifteen.

This shortly is the scheme which I would put before you, and I have no doubt that you will give your earnest consideration to it.

With best wishes,

Yours Sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * *

In November, 1945, Quaid-i-Azam wrote the following letter to Pir Sahib of Manki Sharif:—

"It is needless to emphasise that the Constituent Assembly which would be Pre-

dominantly Muslim in its composition, would be able to enact laws for Muslims, not inconsistent with the Shariat laws and the Muslims will no longer be obliged to abide by the Un-Islamic laws."

* * *

ALLAMA MASHRIQI

On 28th April, 1942, Allama Mashriqi sent the following cable to Quaid-i-Azam.

"Ex-premier Rajagopalacharia also Editor Srinivasan suggest, in their messages of 22nd, my mediation between League and Congress concerning united demand National Government. Moment critical, Unity essential. Do you agree mediation. ?"

On 5th May, the following cable was sent by Allama Mashriqi—

"My telegram dated 28th April unreplied. Can you state minimum conditions for united demand for National Government? Do you approve active cooperation of Khaksars with Rajagopalacharia."

On 11th May Quaid-i-Azam replied—

"Your telegram 5th May. My appeal to Khaksars is to join and support wholeheartedly League policy at this critical juncture. Not possible

discuss terms united demand as requested by means correspondence Jinnah.

On 16th May, another telegram was sent to Quaid-i-Azam by Mr. Mashriqi—

"Your telegram 11th May. Assure you Khaksars' unflinching support every endeavour Muslim League for India's complete independence. Muslim —Hindu unity, united demands, united private protection of evacuees. Fix date discussion terms united demand New-Delhi."—Inayatullah Khan.

On 12th June 1942, the following message was brought in writing from Bombay by Dr. Hajee Aslam Chishti from Quaid-i-Azam.

"I received Allama Mashriqi's telegram today. My clear reply is that until the Congress tentatively withdraws the "Allahabad Resolution" how can attention be given to these proposals. If the Congress withdraws this resolution, I am prepared to negotiate."

On 19th June Allama Mashriqi cabled— Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, Bombay.

Abulkalamazad and Jawarlalnehru both write expressing unequivocal immediate friendly settlement. Prepared calling working commiittee meeting for selection representative after your agreeability Your insistence in message through Haji

aslam chisthi withdrawal Allahabad Resolution mere technicality. Unnecessary. Yourself responsible delay. Beseech immediate agreement.

Inayatullah Khan.

On 25th June, Allama Mashriqi sent the following telegram—

"Congratulations Jinnah Rajgopalachariar Meeting. Fervently urge tangible results.

"Inayatullah Khan."

MARCH 1944

Letter from Allama Mashriqi dated 18th March, 1944—

"I have learnt just this minute that you are in Lahore and attending some occasion. Events of the past some months have made you cause a breach between the Khaksars and the Muslim League and I have yet to know if I am to blame for that. My conviction is that Mussalmans and Hindus must come to an understanding at this critical moment, in order to gain Pakistan as well as independence for India; but you in your fury are losing these precious moments amidst despair and inaction.

I am open to conviction if you can convince me otherwise. You told Khaksars in Quetta that I should have written to you or met you if I thought you were mistaken. I have persistently written and do write again. I shall be pleased to meet you if you come to Ichhra, but if my humble invitation does not suit you I do not feel at all small if I come over to you.

Please let me know per bearer as I think we must come to an agreement. I hope you are well."

Quaid-i-Azam's reply dated 18th March, 1944—

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th of March, late last night, and I regret very much indeed to note that you have thought fit to accuse me for having caused the breach between the Khaksars and the Muslim League and further you convey and insinuate that I am, to use your own expression. "in my fury" opposed to Hindu-Muslim understanding under any circumstances. There is no truth whatsoever in these allegations that you make against me, and you should know that there is no justification for it. I have repeatedly made my position clear by my statements and speeches that have been broadcast in the press.

However, as you say you are open to conviction, may I draw your attention to the fact that now, the All-India Muslim League has appointed a Committee of Action, in whom are vested all the powers of organising the Muslim League, and request you to get in touch with the chairman

Nawab Mohamed Ismail Khan, whose address is Mustafa Castle, Meerut, U.P. or the convener Nawabzaba Liaquat ali Khan whose address is, 8B, Hardinge Avenue, New Delhi as they are free from accusations and reflections that you have cast on me both in this letter under reply and by your previous writings and statements that you have issued to the press heretofore; and I hope that in that atmosphere they may be able to convince you that the policy and the principles and the programme of the League are in the best interest of Muslim India. I am informed that the full Committee of Action is going to meet at Delhi on the 25th instant. I am releasing this letter to the press as I notice that you have already published yours without waiting for my reply."

Allama Mashriqi sent the following letter on 19th March, 1944—

"Your reply to my letter of last night received after much persuasion after 16 hours, settles that I am not to blame for not meeting you for an understanding between the Mussalmans and the Hindus or even between the Mussalmans themselves. My assertion, therefore, that you made an attempt to cause the breach between the Khaksars and the Muslim League stands true. Please reconsider the position in which you have involved yourself by this refusal. I can assure you that the Khaksar is not against the Muslim League in spite of everything that has happened.

Your reference to the "Committee of Action"

as having been given powers to organise the Muslim League is most amusing as this means that you consider Muslim League to be a disorganised body so far. I assure you that the disorganisation is solely due to your inaction and despair also if I may add to the expectant sentiments you arouse at the shows you make in public and the high words you give to them. I can respectfully assure that the Mussalman public is tired of all this.

I have asked you to reconsider your decision not to meet me, but I confess here that I shall be one of your lieutenants if you show real action. As regards your "Committee of Action" I shall certainly give my best attention to it if it shows any action.

As a last word I can only say that if you as the Quaid-i-Azam of the Mussalmans of India do not show any real action in the matter of Hindu-Muslim understanding or in getting Pakistan for the Mussalmans I shall be compelled to the conclusion that the Mussalmans of India must leave you alone and try their luck elsewhere.

With best expectations that I shall get a more prompt reply. I am. &c.,

"Inayatullah Khan"

AUGUST 1944

On 1st August, 1944 Allama Mashriqi addressed the following letter to Quaid-i-Azam—

"After anxious and patient moments of the

last few weeks when I finally wrote to you, I have my most sincere appreciation that you have come forward to alter the destiny of India to something better, however, little, and I assure you again that, I, along with every Khaksar that is in the land, will work with you in the full spirit of loyalty and friendship for the achievement of Pakistan, and consequently, the independence of India.

"I deliberately ask my pardon for the harsh, words spoken both in public and in my letters to you, as I feel intensely delighted over the words you uttered in Rawalpindi that you were working for the freedom, not only of 10 crores of Muslims but of 30 crores of non-Muslims as well. I can only say that the utterance will stand out as a pledge of your sincerity to India in the grave talks that are coming. "Mr. Gandhi is to be congratulated no less for the bold and rank letter that he has written and I am sending a telegram of profound thankfulness to him today. I am also writing to him but these moves have already cleared the tense atmosphere that existed and I assure you that Hindus and Muslims are more ready for an understanding today than they were ever before.

"I have purposely refrained from saying anything concerning the formula put forward by the ex-Premier of Madras, chiefly because you were silent, but also because, as I told you, I was determined to bring the matter of your meeting with Mr. Gandhi to a tangible conclusion. You are shrewd enough to see through it yourself, but as far as the Khaksars are concerned no stone will be

left unturned in order to bring your conversations with Mr. Gandhi to the successful conclusion that every soul in India demands. May god help you and Mr. Gandhi as well.

"On this serious occasion in the history of India I am proposing to order a batch of Khaksars to reach Bombay and shall if possible, reach Bombay myself for the purpose of begging you and Mr. Gandhi with folded hands to reach a suitable settlement satisfactory to both parties. I have no doubt that a settlement is bound to be reached with these good beginnings on both sides and that you as well as Mr. Gandhi will appreciate the reaching of this mixed batch of Hindu as well as Muslim Khaksars at time of your conversations. I am writing to Mr. Gandhi also to the same effect."

* * *

SIR MIRZA ISMAIL

In early part of 1941 Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoolah conveyed his scheme to Sir Mirza Ismail which was in favour of a unitary system of government for India. Sir Ismail in reply advocated Federation. In the course of further correspondence, Sir Rahimtoola suggested that a conference be convened consisting of the most prominent political leaders in India. He wrote: "Before you finally decide this issue it appears to me that the best course would be for you to send confidentially a copy of my letter to Mr. Gandhi and to Mr. Jinnah asking them whether they approve of the idea, whether

they would advise you to call this conference or whether they would attend it in their individual capacity." Both, Quaid-i-Azam and Mr. Gandhi, disagreed with the suggestions.

Letter from Sir Mirza Ismail dated July 14, 1941.

I hope you will forgive my troubling you with a request, I enclose copies of correspondence between Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoolah and myself on the subject of the political problem of India. In his last letter to me, dated the 7th July, of which also I enclose a copy, he asks me to consult you in regard to his proposal for the summoning of a conference to discuss this question.

I am not sure if the suggestion appeals to you at all, but I shall be glad if you will favour me with your views.

I have long held the view, and have repeatedly urged it on the attention of Mahatma Gandhi and other friends, that a constituent committee should be appointed at the earliest possible moment to formulate proposals for the attainment by India of a position of equality in the British Commonwealth of Nations as soon as practicable. That committee would be essentially an Indian committee. The British Government would not come into it at all. They would only be asked to consider its report after the termination of the war.

The first problem the committee would have

to solve, if its labours were to be successful, would be the communal one. There you would come in, and I feel that a committee of this kind would afford the best chance of a solution of the problem, a solution which might be regarded as satisfactory by all parties.

Otherwise, what is the alternative? The present bitterness will go on increasing, resulting in unhappiness all round and in the disastrous weakening of the country's position at a time when she should be united and strong. As I told you in person the other day when you were here, I do not understand how anybody can object to recognizing a patent fact, namely, the position of the Muslim League as the only All-India organization which can speak on behalf of the entire Muslim population of India. And you, as the unanimously elected head of that organization, should be regarded as—and you really are—the only accredited spokesman of the Muslim community. Your membership of the proposed committee would not militate against that position. I hope that you will give due considerations to all aspects of the question and favour me with your views.

I am going to Poona for the Sapru Conference and mean to put forward the suggestion of a committee. So far, Sir Tej has shown no inclination to accept it and I doubt if anything will come of it. I am, of course, quite prepared for a disappointment, but I shall, nevertheless, persist, convinced as I am that there is no better way of solving the Indian problem.

Quaid-i-Azam's reply dated July 17, 1941:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 15th of July, 1941, enclosing correspondence between Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoolah and yourself on the subject of the political problem of India.

To begin with I notice that you two fundamentally differ as to the basis. Secondly, your letter is very sad reading inasmuch as you are again repeating your proposal and want me to agree to your being an intermediary, to which, apart from the question of the merits and demerits of your proposal to form a committee, I cannot agree. During the course of our conversation at Bangalore in May last, for various reasons which I pointed out to you that such a move on your part will be highly undesirable, you agreed and assured me that you will not do anything in the matter. Since then, from your activities, I gather that you have broken your assurance to me. You know my views about the Sapru Conference, which were broadcast in the Press not very long ago, and I do not want to say anything further which may hurt you. Nevertheless, I suppose, as a "nonparty man" you find that platform suitable to you and have decided to attend it; but of course I cannot approve of your decision as in my opinion it is calculated to harm the Muslim cause.

I am glad to note that you say, "I do not understand how anybody can object to recognizing a patent fact, the position of the Muslim League as the only All-India organization which can speak

on behalf of the entire Muslim population of India."
I also thank you for a great compliment that you have been pleased to pay me, when you say, "and you as the unanimously elected head of that organization should be regarded as—and you really are—the only accredited spokesman of the Muslim community."

In these circumstances don't you think that you can do much more useful service in joining the Muslim League and make your full contribution for the betterment of that great organization, now that you are free from the shackles of your office, for I wonder what you will achieve by attending the "Sapru Conference."

I am of opinion that it is the duty of every Musalman to join the Muslim League and help and guide the organization from within and not to act as a super-individual leader, which is not only harmful to the cause of the Musalmans but India generally.

Letter of Sir Ismail dated July 23, 1941:

I have received your kind letter of the 17th. You say that I am trying to act as an intermediary. I have no such intention, let me assure you, especially where you are concerned. I wrote to you, as you will have seen from Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoolah's letter to me, simply at his special request. I would not have thought of troubling you otherwise. A request coming from a man of the high position of Sir Ibrahim had to be complied with, and I am

not sorry I did, as I feel I have pleased him thereby, though I knew full well that I would be displeasing you.

You invite me to join the Muslim League. I wish I was in a position to do so, but, you will no doubt realize, my lifelong association with a Hindu Maharaja and my long service in a Hindu State where I have received the most loyal co-operation from my Hindu fellow-citizens throughout my official career, prevent me from identifying myself with a political organization which is avowedly anti-Hindu in its aims and objects. My own endeavour will be to work—in so far as it lies in my power—for communal concord, while safeguarding the legitimate interests of my own community to the fullest extent. Your aim, too, is, unless I am much mistaken, not very different, though the policy you advocate and the methods you adopt in carrying it out may not be the same.

As regards the Poona Conference, I am going there simply out of regard and affection of Sir Tej and you may rest assured that I am not likely to say or do anything in the least likely to do any harm to the Muslim cause.

Quaid-i-Azam's reply—

I am in receipt of your letter of the 23rd of July, 1941, and I must most emphatically controvert your statement characterizing the Muslim League as "a political organization which is avowedly anti-Hindu in its aims and objects". That has grieved me coming from a man of your position

and understanding and let me emphasise that it is not true. As to the rest of your letter I have nothing to add to what I have already said in my previous letter of the 17th of July.

* * *

Also published at Pages 280-282

NAICKER—JINNAH

Letter from Mr. Naicker, dated Erode, August 9, 1944.

My dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have been watching carefully the proceedings of Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula towards solving the dead-lock and your desire to receive Mr. Gandhi at your residence in Bombay on your return which will probably be about the middle of August. It is welcomed in political circles. Though I have no full hope, there are signs of change as our opponents have come forward themselves to settle the Hindu-Muslim questions, especially in relation to Cripp's offer.

I need not say that Congressites are experts in twisting words, and to give occult sense. They can say anything and give meaning in whatever manner they think. Though we do not depend upon them, you know very well that we should be vigilant and careful in the negotiations.

It is clear that general election with Muslims and Hindus as well as Aryans and Dravidians will give hardship to both of us. Kindly excuse me for reminding you about our discussions relating to Pakistan and Dravidastan while we were at Madras and Delhi and your assurance that you would plead for both questions as one. Here in South India, I considered both the questions as one and done my best to solve the problem as far as possible.

Yourself know very well that there could be no Pakistan and the independence of Muslim India until and unless independence was achieved for the rest of the nations.

With kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,

E. V. Ramaswami Naicker.

Quaid-i-Azam's reply, Bombay dated 17th August, 1944.

Dear Mr. Ramaswami,

I am in receipt of your letter of August 9, thank you for it. I have always had much sympathy for the people of Madras 90 per cent of whom are Non-Brahmins, and if they desire to establish their Dravidastan it is entirely for your people to decide on this matter. I can say no more, and certainly I cannot speak on your behalf.

I have made the position clear to you and your colleagues when I was in Madras more than once, but hitherto I have noticed that in your activities you have been undecisive. If the people of your province really desire Dravidastan, then it is for them to assert themselves.

I hope that you will understand my position that I can only speak for Muslim India but you have my assurance that wherever and whenever I have a say in the matter, you will find me supporting any just and fair claim or demand of any section of the peoples of India, and particularly the non-Brahmins of South India.

Yours Sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

* * * * *

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the President of the Muslim League, dated 10th May, 1946.

In accordance with our decision yesterday at the conference, my colleagues have given a good deal of thought to the choice of a suitable umpire. We have felt that it would probably be desirable to exclude Englishmen, Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. The field is thus limited. Nevertheless we have drawn up a considerable list from which a choice can be made. I presume that you have also, in consultation with your executive, prepared a list of possible umpires. Would you like these two lists to be considered by us, that is, by you and me? If so, we can fix up a meeting for the purpose. After we have met, our recommendation can be considered by the eight of us, that is, the four representatives of the Congress and the four representatives of the Muslim League, and a final choice can be made, which we can place before the conference when it meets tomorrow.

Letter from the President of the Muslim League to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, dated May 10, 1946.

I received your letter of 10th May at 6 p.m.

At yesterday's meeting between you and me at the Viceregal Lodge, we discussed several points besides the fixing of an umpire. After a short discussion, we came to the conclusion that we will further examine your proposal made by you at the conference yesterday, with all its implications after your and my consulting our respective colleagues.

I shall be glad to meet you to consider the various aspects of your proposal any time that may suit you tomorrow morning after 10 o'clock.

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the President of the Muslim League, dated 11th May, 1946.

Your letter of May 10th reached me at ten last night.

During the talk we had at Viceregal Lodge you referred to various matters besides the choice of an umpire and I gave you my reactions in regard to them. But I was under the impression that the proposal to have an umpire had been agreed to and our next business was to suggest names. Indeed it was when some such agreement was reached in the conference that we had our talk. My colleagues have proceeded on this basis and prepared a list of suitable names. The conference will expect us to tell them this afternoon the name of the umpire we fix upon, or at any rate to place before them suggestions in this behalf.

The chief implication in having an umpire is

to agree to accept his final decision. We agree to this. We suggest that we might start with this and report accordingly to the conference.

As suggested by you, I shall come over to your place of residence at about 10-30 this morning.

Letter from the President of the Muslim League to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Dated May 11, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of the 11th May.

During the talk we had at the Viceregal Lodge, which lasted for about fifteen or twenty minutes, I pointed out various aspects and implications of your proposal and we had a discussion for a little while, but no agreement was arrived at between you and me on any point except that at your suggestion that you consult your colleagues and I should do likewise we adjourned to meet again the next day to further discuss the matter.

I shall be glad to meet you at 10.30 this morning for further talk.

Letter from Pandit Nehru to Mr. Jinnah from Wardha, Dated August 13, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

As you know, the Viceroy has invited me in my capacity as President of the Congress, to make proposals for the immediate formation of the interim government. I have accepted the invita-

tion. I feel that my first step should be to approach you and seek your co-operation in the formation of a coalition provisional government. It is naturally our desire to have as representative a government as possible. Should you wish to discuss this matter further with me, before coming to a decision, I shall gladly see you in Bombay or wherever you may be. I am leaving Wardha on the 14th and reaching Bombay on the 15th August forenoon. Probably I shall leave Bombay for Delhi on the morning of August 17.

Reply from Mr. Jinnah to Pandit Nehru from Bombay, dated August 15, 1946.

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

I received your letter, dated the 13th yesterday, delivered to me by hand.

I know nothing as to what has transpired between the Viceroy and you; nor have I any idea of what agreement has been arrived at between you two, except what you say in your letter that the Viceroy has invited you, in your capacity as the President of the Congress, to make proposals for the immediate formation of the interim government and that you have accepted the invitation.

"If this means that the Viceroy has commissioned you to form the Executive Council of the Governor-General and has already agreed to accept and act upon your advice and proceed to constitute

his Executive accordingly, it is not possible for me to accept such a position on that basis.

"However, if you care to meet me on behalf of the Congress to settle the Hindu-Muslim question and resolve the serious deadlock, I shall be glad to see you today at 6 p.m.

The substance of your letter, unfortunately, has already appeared in the press even before I received it. May, I, therefore, request you to release this letter of mine also to the press?

Sd:—M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Pandit Nehru to Mr. Jinnah, Dated August 15, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of today's date which was delivered to me at about 1 p.m.

Nothing hs transpired between me and the Viceroy except what has already been published. There is no arrangement other than what is contained in his brief offer and our acceptance. That offer, made by the Viceroy with the concurrence of the British Government, is for us to make proposals for the formation immediately of an interim government. The Executive Council of the Governor-General has not been mentioned as such. It is understood, as stated in the published correspondence between the Congress President and the

Viceroy, that the interim government will have the greatest possible freedom in the exercise of the day-to-day administration of this country.

Since this brief offer was made and we accepted it, I have had no opportunity to meet the Viceroy or discuss the matter with him more fully. I hope to do so within the next two or three days. It was our wish, however, that I might approach you first and invite your co-operation. We are naturally anxious to form a government, which will be as representative as possible in order to deal with the urgent problems facing this country.

In your letter you state that you are unable to accept the position as it appears to you. I regret this. Perhaps, on fuller consideration of the position you would be agreeable to reconsider your decision. If so, we would welcome it. For this purpose I shall gladly see you, if you so desire.

As regards the general Hindu—Muslim question, we are always prepared to discuss this and try to find a way out. Just at present we are immediately concerned with the formation of the provisional government and circumstances demand that early steps should be taken in regard to it. We hope that a coalition provisional government will itself help in the consideration and solution of our problems. While I am willing to discuss the larger question with you, I have no new suggestions to make. Perhaps you may be able to suggest a new approach.

I am prepared to come to your place at 6 p.m. this evening, or if it is more convenient to you, some time tomorrow. I am leaving Bombay on the 17th morning.

My letter to you was not sent to the press. I made a brief statement to the press, however, in view of repeated questions put to me by newspapermen and in order to prevent misconceptions, if you so desire, you can release all this correspondence to the Press.

Sd.:—Jawaharlal Nehru.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Pandit Nehru, dated August 15, 1946.

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

I am in receipt of your letter of August 15, delivered to me at about 3.30 p.m. and I thank you for it.

I have already made my position clear in my letter dated the 15th of August, sent to you this morning. But as you have given certain explanations, with some of which I must not be taken to agree, and as you desire to meet, I shall be glad to see you today at 6 p.m.

I agree with you that in order to prevent misconception in the mind of the public, our corres-

pondence should be published and accordingly I am releasing it to the press.

Sd:—M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr. M.A. Jinnah, dated October 6, 1946.

I have consulted some of my colleagues about the matters discussed by us yesterday and over the possibility of rapprochement between the Muslim League and the Congress. We are all agreed that nothing could be happier and better for the country than that these two organisations should meet again as before as friends having no mental reservations and bent on resolving all their differences by mutual consultation and never desiring or allowing the intervention of the British Government through the Viceroy or others or of any other foreign Power. We would, therefore, welcome the decision of the League to join the interim government for it to work as a united team on behalf of India as a whole.

The points put forward by you in our conversation yesterday were:

(1) the formula suggested to you by Gandhiji;

(2) the League not being responsible for the members at present representing the Scheduled Castes and the minorities;

(3) what should be done in case any vacancy should arise among the members representing the minorities other than the Scheduled Castes;

(4) the procedure to be adopted over what may be called major communal issues, and

(5) alternating Vice—Presidentship.

Regarding No. 1, we feel that the formula is not happily worded. We do not question the purpose uderlying it. We are willing, as a result of the elections, to accept the Muslim League as the authoritative representative organisation of an overwhelming majority of the Muslims of India and that as such and in accordance with democratic principles they have today the unquestionable right to present the Muslims of India, provided that for identical reasons the League recognises the Congress as the authoritative organisation representing all non-Muslims and such Muslims as have thrown in their lot with the Congress. The Congress cannot agree to any restriction or limitations to be put upon it in choosing such representatives as they think proper from amongst the members of the Congress. We would suggest, therefore, that no formula is necessary and each organisation may stand on its merits.

Regarding No. 2, I am to say that the question of the League being responsible does not arise and, as you do not raise any objections to the present

constitution of the Government in this respect, there is no question to be solved.

Regarding No. 3, I am to say that if any such vacancy arises, the whole Cabinet will consider what should be done, to replace the vacancy and advise the Viceroy accordingly. There can be no question of right in the matter of consultation with the League in regard to the representation of these minorities.

Regarding No. 4, your suggestion about the Federal Court is not feasible. Matters coming before the Cabinet cannot be made subject-matter of references to court. We should thrash out all such matters amongst ourselves and bring up agreed proposals before the Cabinet. In the event of failure to reach an agreed decision, we should seek the method of arbitration of our own choice. We hope, however, that we will act with such mutual trust, forbearance and friendliness that there will be no occasion to go to such arbitration.

Regarding No. 5, it is out of the question to have any rotation in the Vice-Presidentship. We have no objection if you desire to have an additional Vice-Chairman for the Co-ordination Committee of the Cabinet, who can also preside at such committee meetings from time to time.

I am hoping that if your Committee finally decide upon the League joining the National Cabinet, they will also decide simultaneously to join the

Constituent Assembly, or recommend to your Council to this effect.

I need hardly mention that when an agreement has been reached by us it can only be varied by mutual agreement and not otherwise."

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Dated October 7, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of 6th October, 1946 and I thank you for it. I appreciate and reciprocate your sentiments expressed in paragraph 1 of your letter.

With regard to the second paragraph of your letter, point No. 1, the formula, it was accepted by Mr. Gandhi and me and the meeting between us was arranged on that basis in order to negotiate and settle a few other points remaining for the purpose of reconstituting the interim government. The formula runs as follows:

'The Congress does not challenge and accept that the Muslim League now is the authoritative representative of an overwhelming majority of the Muslims of India. As such and in accordance with democratic principles they alone have today an unquestionable right to represent the Muslims of India. But the Congress cannot agree that any restriction or limitation should be put upon the Congress to choose such representatives as they think proper from amongst the members of the Congress as their representatives.'

And now, in your letter under reply, not only you have made changes in it but you consider no formula is necessary! I regret I cannot agree to any change in the language or otherwise as it was the agreed basis of our discussion on other points; nor can I agree with you that no formula is necessary. It was signed by Mr. Ghandhi and accepted by me.

As the whole basis of our talk on other matters was the formula agreed to by Mr. Gandhi, I don't think we can make any further progress unless it is accepted by you as a basis upon which we can proceed to discuss other points we have already discussed orally in the course of our conversation and now I am enclosing herewith a copy of the various points put by me before you in writing.

Even the four points, excluding point No. 1, regarding the formula which I have already dealt with above, you don't agree with any one of them. I am still willing, on the basis of the formula being accepted by you, to further discuss the various points with a view to settle them in the spirit of the sentiments expressed by you in paragraph 1. I am anxious that we should come to our own settlement without undue delay.

ENCLOSURES (9 POINTS)

1. The total number of the members of the Executive Council to be 14.

2. Six nominees of the Congress will include one Scheduled Castes representative, but it must

not be taken that the Muslim League has agreed to, or approves of, the selection of the Scheduled Castes representative. The ultimate responsibility in that behalf being with the Governor-General and the Viceroy.

3. That the Congress should not include in the remaining five members of their quota a Muslim of their choice.

4. Safeguad.—That there should be a convention that on major communal issues, if the majority of Hindu or Muslim members of the Executive Council are opposed, then no decision should be taken.

5. Alternative or rotational Vice-President should be appointed in fairness to both the major communities as it was adopted in the U.N.O. Conference.

6. The Muslim League was not consulted in the selection of the three minority representatives, i.e. Sikh, Indian Christian and Parsi, and it should not be taken that the Muslim League approves of the selection that has been made. But in future, in the event of there being a vacancy owing to death, resignation or otherwise, representatives of these minorities should be chosen in consultation with the two major parties-the Muslim League and the Congress.

7. Portfolios.—The most important portfolios should be equally distributed between the

two major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress.

8. That the above arrangement should not be changed or modified unless both the major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress—agree.

9. The question of the settlement of the long-term plan should stand over until a better and more conducive atmosphere is created and an agreement has been reached on the points stated above and after the interim government has been reformed and finally set up.

This is what Mr. Gandhi said at a prayer meeting, after signing the formula stated in the above letter:

(Mr. Gandhi went on to say how he felt impelled to tell them of the error committed by him three days ago. He was thoroughly ashamed of it. For him, at this time of life, it was unpardonable. No harm had been done to anyone because of it. It was not possible for him to remember ever having done anything to hurt anyone.

His error consisted in being overhasty. He read a little thing hurriedly, though there was no occasion for hurry, and fancied it was quite right whereas it was not quite that. No public servant had the right to act in this way. He seemed, for the moment, to have lost confidence in himself and the belief that he would live for 125 years.

Mr. Gandhi said they who listened to him were his world for the time. He was telling them of his mistake in order that they may learn a lesson from it and, never be hasty or careless in their actions. While his mind had been relieved of a burden through confession, Mr. Gandhi said it would take a long time for him to regain the lost confidence as far as living 125 years was concerned.)

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr. Jinnah, dated October 8, 1946.

I received your letter of the 7th October as I was going to Baroda House to meet you there last eveing. I hurriedly glanced through it and was perturbed by it as it seemed to me to be at variance with the spirit of our talk the previous day. Subsequently we discussed various points and unfortunately could not convince each other.

On my return I read through your letter more carefully and consulted some of my colleagues. They were also disturbed not only by the letter but also by the list of points attached to it. This list had not been seen or considered by us previously. It had little relevance after our talk.

We have again given earnest consideration to the whole matter and we feel that we cannot state our position more clearly than I did in my letter to you of October 6, except for some variations which I shall indicate below. I shall, therefore, refer you to that letter of mine which represents our general and specific view point.

As I have told you, my colleagues and I did not accept the formula agreed to by Gandhiji and you.

The meeting between you and me was not arranged, so far as I was aware, on the agreed basis of that formula. We knew of it and were prepared to agree to the substance of that formula as stated to you in my letter of October 6. That formula contained a further paragraph which you have not quoted in your letter:

'It is understood that all the Ministers of the interim government will work as a team for the good of the whole of India and will never invoke the intervention of the Governor-General in any case.'

While we still think that the formula is not happily worded, we are prepared, for the sake of the settlement we so earnestly desire, to accept the whole of it, including the paragraph left out in your letter.

In that case you will agree, I hope, that we should make our further position quite clear. It is clearly understood of course that the Congress has the right to appoint a Muslim out of its quota. Further, as I have stated in my previous letter, the Congress position in regard to the Nationalist Muslims and the smaller minorities should not be challenged by you.

In regard to points numbered 2, 3 and 4 in

my letter of October 6, I have stated our position and have nothing further to add. We have gone as far as we could to meet you and we are unable to go further. I trust that you will appreciate the position.

Regarding No. 5 (the question of the Vice-President), you made a suggestion yesterday that the Vice-President and the Leader of the House (the Central Assembly) should not be the same person. In present circumstances this means that the Leader of the House should be a Muslim League member of the Cabinet. We shall agree to this.

I am writing this letter to you after full and careful consideration of all the issues involved and after consulting such of my colleagues as are here. It is in no spirit of carrying on an argument that I have written but rather to indicate to you our earnest desire to come to an agreement. We have discussed these matters sufficiently and the time has come for us to decide finally.

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, dated October 12, 1946.

I received your letter dated 8th October, 1946, yesterday in reply to my letter of October 7, 1946.

I regret that you and your colleagues do not accept the formula agreed to by Mr. Gandhi and me.

Mr. Gandhi and I had also agreed that on that basis you and I should meet in order to

negotiate and settle a few other points that remained for the purpose of reconstituting the interim government. Accordingly arrangements were made for our meeting on the 5th of October.

I am surprised to gather from your letter, when you say that the meeting was not arranged, so far as you were aware, on the agreed basis of that formula. The only formula agreed upon between Mr. Gandhi and me was that which was mentioned in my letter of October 7, 1946. I had not mentioned in my letter, what is referred to by you as paragraph 2 as that was one of the points among others to be further examined and discussed by you and me. This arrangement was actually put on record.

At our first meeting on the 5th of October, we discussed all the points and you informed me that you will let me know the time that will suit you to meet me the next day, but, instead of that, I received your letter of 6th October, 1946. In this letter you yourself referred to the formula as one mentioned in my letter of 7th October, and expressed your view that the formula was not happily worded and suggested a modification by inserting a proviso as follows:

> 'Provided that for identical reasons the League recognises the Congress as the authoritative organisation representing all non-Muslims and such Muslims as have thrown in their lot with the Congress.'

or else, if that was not agreed to you suggested no

formula was necessary. There is no reference in your letter to what you describe as paragraph 2 as part of the agreed formula and you yourself dealt with that point quite separately in the opening paragraph of your letter which runs as follows:

> 'We are all agreed that nothing would be happier and better for the country than that these two organisations should meet again as before as friends having no mental reservations by mutual consultation and never desiring or allowing the intervention of the British Government through the Viceroy or others or of any other foreign Power.'

That, in substance, was the idea of the paragraph 2, mentioned by you, which among other matters was to be examined and discussed. I also referred to this matter in my reply stating that I appreciated and reciprocated the sentiments expressed in paragraph 1 of your letter of 6th October, 1946.

I fail to understand why you and your colleagues should have been disturbed not only by my letter of the 7th October, but also by the list of points attached to it. There was nothing new in that list of points which we had not discussed the first day, as it is clear from your letter of October 6, wherein you yourself have dealt with everyone of the points mentioned in the list that I sent to you. Let me

take one by one the points in the list sent to you in writing:

(1) Total number of 14:
That was not in dispute.

(2) The Scheduled Castes' representative:
That the League must not be taken to have agreed or approved of the selection, which is referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter.

(3) Nomination of Muslims in Congress quota:
The matter was discussed.

(4) Safeguard:
That was discussed as is clear from point 4 in your letter.

(5) Alternative or rotational Vice-President:
We discussed and is referred as point No. 5 in your letter.

(6) Vacancies occurring in the seats allotted to minority representatives:
This matter was discussed and is referred to by you in your letter point No. 3.

(7) Portfolios:
The matter was discussed.

(8) No change in the arrangements agreed to without the consent of both the major parties:
This was discussed and is referred to in the last paragraph of your letter.

(9) The long-term question:
This was discussed and is mentioned in your letter last but one paragraph.

All these points were discussed as is clear from what I have pointed out above and the list was sent to you merely as a matter of convenience and preciseness.

You state in your letter under reply that your position is the same with regard to the various matters that were discussed between us as is mentioned in your letter of the 6th of October, except for some variations which you have indicated in your letter.

Following are the variations and my reaction to them:

(1) That you would accept the formula provided paragraph 2 is included in the formula and is made a part of it.

This constitutes a fundamental departure from the original formula upon the basis of which I had agreed to have discussions with you. I cannot agree to this variation.

(2) Provided that the Muslim League does not challenge that the Congress represents the minorities and the Nationalist Muslims as indicated in terms of your previous letter of the 6th October and referred to in your letter under reply.

This again is a serious departure from the agreed formula. Besides this is a matter for the minorities concerned.

I note what you say with regard to points 2, 3 and 4 of your letter of October 6, i.e. Scheduled Castes' representative and other minorities; the position about the vacancies occurring in future in the seats allotted to the minorities and the procedure to be adopted with regard to major communal issues. Even, with regard to these points there is no agreement between us.

With regard to point No. 5 Vice-Presidentship, I note what you say.

Since you have stated you position after full and careful consideration of all the issues involved and after consultation with your colleagues, I presume that it follows that this is your final stand. I deeply regret that we have failed to come to an honourable agreement of our own satisfactory to both the parties.

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr. M. A. Jinnah, dated October 13, 1946.

I thank you for your letter of the 12th October. In this letter there are a number of mis-statements. What you have said does not fit in with my recollection of our conversations or what has taken place during the past few days. I need not, however, go into this matter now as I have been informed by the Viceroy that the Muslim League have agreed to nominate five persons on their behalf as members of the interim government.

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Pandit Jawa harlal Nehru, Dated October 14, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of October 13, 1946, and I thank you for it.

There is considerable speculation indulged in by the press and varying accounts are given of our negotiations and the termination of our discussions. I, therefore, propose to release all the correspondence passed between you and me, beginning with your letter of the 6th October and ending with your letter of the 13th.

* * *

MISSION—CONGRESS—LEAGUE—CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Lord Pethick—Lawrence to Mr. Jinnah Dated 27th April, 1946.

The Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy have carefully reviewed the opinions expressed to them by the various representatives they have interviewed and have come to the conclusion that they should make one further attempt to obtain agreement between the Muslim League and the Congress.

They realise that it would be useless to ask the two parties to meet unless they were able to place

before them a basis of negotiation which could lead to such an agreement.

I am, therefore, asked to invite the Muslim League to send four negotiators to meet the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy together with a similar number from the Congress Working Committee with a view to discussing the possibility of agreement upon a scheme based upon the following fundamental principles:

The future constitutional structure of British India to be as follows:

A Union Government dealing with the following subjects:

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications. There will be two groups of provinces, the one of the predominantly Hindu provinces and the other of the predominantly Muslim Provinces, dealing with all other subjects which the provinces in the respective groups desire to be dealt with in common. The Provincial Governments will deal with all other subjects and will have all the residuary sovereign rights.

It is contemplated that the Indian States will take their appropriate place in this structure on terms to be negotiated with them.

I would point out that we do not think it either necessary or desirable further to elaborate these

principles as all other matters could be dealt with in the course of the negotiations.

If the Muslim League and Congress are prepared to enter into negotiations on this basis, you will perhaps be so good as to let me know the names of the four people appointed to negotiate on their behalf. As soon as I receive these I will let you know the locus of the negotiations which will in all probability be in Simla, where the climate will be more temperate.

Letter from the President of the Muslim League to Lord Pethick-Lawrence, dated 29th April, 1946.

I thank you for your letter of the 27th April, which I placed before my Working Committee, yesterday morning.

My colleagues and I fully appreciate the further attempt that the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy are making to bring about an agreement between the Muslim League and the Congress by proposing a meeting of the representatives of the two organisations for the purpose of negotiating an agreement. They, however, desire me to invite your attention to the position taken up by the Muslim League since the passing of the Lahore Resolution in 1940, and, thereafter, successively endorsed by the All-India Muslim League Sessions and again by the Convention of the Muslim League Legislators, as recently as the 9th of April, 1946, as per copy enclosed.

The Working Committee desire to point out that many important matters, both of principle and detail, in your brief letter, require elucidation and clarification, which, in their opinion, can be achieved at the meeting proposed by you.

Therefore, without prejudice or commitment the Working Committee, in their anxiety to assist in finding an agreed solution of the Indian constitutional problem, have authorised me to nominate three representatives on behalf of the Muslim League to participate in the negotiations.

The following are the four names:

1. Mr. M. A. Jinnah; 2. Nawab Mohammad Ismail Khan; 3. Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan and 4. Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar.

ENCLOSURE.

Resolution, passed by the Subjects Committee, to be placed before the All-India Muslim League Legislators' Convention on April 9, 1946.

Whereas, in this vast subcontinent of India a hundred million Muslims are the adherents of a faith which regulates every department of their life (educational, social, economic and political), whose code is not confined merely to spiritual doctrines and tenets or rituals and ceremonies and which stands in sharp contrast to the exclusive nature of Hindu dharma and philosophy which has fostered and maintained for thousands of years a

rigid Caste System resulting in the degradation of 60 million human beings to the position of untouchables, creation of un-natural barriers between man and man and superimposition of social and economic inequalities on a large body of the people of this country, and which threatens to reduce Muslims, Christians and other minorities to the status of irredeemable helots, socially and economically;

Whereas, the Hindu Caste System is a direct negation of nationalism, equality, democracy and all the noble ideals that Islam stands for;

Whereas, different historical backgrounds, traditions, cultures and social and economic orders of the Hindus and the Muslims have made impossible the evolution of a single Indian nation inspired by common aspirations and ideals and whereas after centuries they still remain two distinct major nations;

Whereas, soon after the introduction by the British of the policy of setting up political institutions in India on the lines of Western democracies based on majority rule which meant that the majority of one nation or society could impose its will on the majority of the other nation or society in spite of their opposition as was amply demonstrated during the two and a half years' regime of Congress Government in the Hindu majority provinces under the Government of India Act, 1935, when the Muslims were subjected to untold harassment and oppression as a result of which they were

convinced of the futility and ineffectiveness of the so-called safeguards provided in the constitution and in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governors and were driven to the irresistible conclusion that in a United Indian Federation, if established, the Muslims even in majority provinces would meet with no better fate and their rights and interests could never be adequately protected against the perpetual Hindu majority at the Centre;

Whereas, the Muslims are convinced that with a view to save Muslim India from the domination of the Hindus and in order to afford them full scope to develop themselves according to their genius, it is necessary to constitute a sovereign independent State comprising Bengal and Assam in the north-east zone and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the north-west zone.

This Convention of the Muslim League Legislators of India, Central and Provincial after careful consideration hereby declares that the Muslim Nation will never submit to any constitution for a United India and will never participate in any single constitution-making machinery set up for the purpose, and that any formula devised by the British Government for transferring power from the British to the peoples of India, which does not conform to the following just and equitable principles calculated to maintain internal peace and tranquillity in the country, will not contribute to the solution of the Indian problem:

1. That the zone comprising Bengal and Assam in the north-east and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the north-west of India, namely Pakistan zones, where the Muslims are in a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State and that an unequivocal understanding be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay;

2. That two separate constitution-making bodies be set up by peoples of Pakistan and Hindustan for the purpose of framing their respective constitutions;

3. That the minorities in Pakistan and Hindustan be provided with safeguards on the lines of the All-India Muslim League Resolution passed on the 23rd March, 1940, at Lahore;

4. That the acceptance of the Muslim League demand of Pakistan and its implementation without delay are the sine qua non for the Muslim League co-operation and participation in the formation of an interim government at the Centre.

This Convention further emphatically declares that any attempt to impose a constitution on a United India basis or to force any interim arrangement at the Centre contrary to the Muslim League demand will leave the Muslims no alternative but to resist such an imposition by all possible means for their survival and national existence.

Letter from Lord Pethic-Lawrence to the

President of the Muslim League, Dated 29th April, 1946.

Thank you for your letter of the 29th April. The Cabinet Delegation are very glad to know that the Muslim League agree to enter the joint discussion with the representatives of the Congress and ourselves. I am glad to say I have received a letter from the President of the Congress to say that they are also willing to participate in the proposed discussions and have nominated Maulana Azad, Pandit Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan as their represen tatives.

We have taken note of the resolution of the Muslim League to which you draw our attention. We have never contemplated that acceptance by the Muslim League and the Congress of our invitation would imply as a preliminary condition full approval by them of the terms set out in my letter. These terms are our proposed basis for a settlement and what we have asked the Muslim League Working Committee to do is to agree to send its representatives to meet ourselves and representatives of the Congress in order to discuss it.

We propose that these discussions should be held at Simla and intend to move there ourselves on Wednesday next. We hope that you will be able to arrange for the Muslim League representatives to be in Simla in time to open the discussions on the morning of Thursday, May 2.

AGENDA

1. Groups of provinces—

(a) Composition.
(b) Method of deciding group subjects.
(c) Character of group organisation.

2. Union.

(a) Union subjects.
(b) Character of Union Constitution.
(c) Finance.

3. Constitution-making machinery—

(a) Composition.
(b) Functions.

(i) in respect of Union;
(ii) in respect of groups;
(iii) in respect of provinces.

Letter from Lord Pethick-Lawrence to the Presidents of the Muslim League and the Congress, dated 8th May, 1946.

My colleagues and I have been thinking over the best method of laying before the conference what in our judgment seems the most likely basis of agreement as shown by the deliberations so far.

We have come to the conclusion that it will be for the convenience of the parties if we commit this

to writing and send them confidential copies before the conference meets again.

We hope to be in a position to let you have this in the course of the morning. But as this will give you too short a time to study it adequately before the proposed resumption of the conference at 3 o'clock this afternoon, I feel sure that you will agree that the meeting be postponed until the same hours (3 o'clock) tomorrow afternoon, Thursday, 9th May, and I hope that you will concur in this change of time which we are convinced is in the interests of all parties.

Letters from the Private Secretary to Lord Pethick-Lawrence to the President of the Muslim League, dated 8th May, 1946.

With reference to the Secretary of State's letter to you this morning the Cabinet Delegation wish me to send to you the enclosed document which is the paper to which the Secretary of State referred. The Delegation propose that this paper should be discussed at the next meeting to be held on Thursday afternoon at 8 p.m. if that is agreeable to the Congress--Muslim League delegates.

Enclosure with letter of 8th May-Suggested points for agreement between the representatives of the Congress and the Muslim League.

1. There shall be an All-India Government and Legislature dealing with Foreign Affairs, Defence, Communications, Fundamental Rights

and having the necessary powers to obtain for itself the finances it requires for these subjects.

2. All the remaining powers shall vest in the provinces.

3. Groups of provinces may be formed and such groups may determine the provincial subjects which they desire to take in common.

4. The groups may set up their own executives and legislatures.

5. The Legislature of the Union shall be composed of equal proportions, from the Muslim majority provinces and from the Hindu majority provinces whether or any of them have formed themselves into groups, together with representatives of the States.

6. The Government of the Union shall be constituted in the same proportion as the Legislature.

7. The constitutions of the Union and the groups (if any) shall contain a provision whereby any province can by a majority vote of its legislative assembly call for a reconsideration of the terms of the constitution after an initial period of ten years and at ten yearly intervals thereafter.

For the purpose of such reconsideration, a body shall be constituted on the same basis as the original Constituent Assembly and with the same provisions as to voting and shall have power to

amend the constitution in any way decided upon.

8. The constitution-making machinery to arrive at constitution on the above basis shall be as follows:

A. Representatives shall be elected from each Provincial Assembly in proportion to the strength of the various parties in that Assembly on the basis of one-tenth of their numbers.

B. Representatives shall be invited from the States on the basis of their population in proportion to the representation from British India.

C. The Constituent Assembly so formed shall meet at the earliest date possible in New Delhi.

D. After its preliminary meeting at which the general order of business will be settled it will divide into three sections, one section representing the Hindu majority provinces, one section representing the Muslim majority provinces and one representing the States.

E. The first two sections will then meet separately to decide the provincial constitutions for their group and, if they wish, a group constitution.

F. When these have been settled it will be open to any province to decide to opt out of its original group and into the other group or to remain outside any group.

G. Thereafter the three bodies will meet together to settle the constitution for the Union on the lines agreed in paragraphs1—7 above.

H. No major point in the Union constitution which affects the communal issue shall be deemed to be passed by the Assembly unless a majority of both the two communities vote in its favour.

9. The Viceroy shall forthwith call together the above constitution-making machinery which shall be governed by the provisions stated in paragraph 8 above.

Letter from the President of the Muslim League to Lord Pethic-Lawrence, dated 8th May, 1946.

I have now received the letter of your Private Secretary, dated 8th May, 1946, and the enclosed document to which you had referred in your earlier letter of 8th May, 1946. It is proposed by you that this "paper" be discussed at the next meeting of the conference to be he held on Thursday afternoon at 3 p.m. if this is agreeable to the Muslim League Delegation.

Your proposal embodied in your letter of 27th April, 1946 runs as follows:

> "A Imopm Government dealing with the following subjects-Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications. There will be two groups of provinces, the one of the predominantly Hindu Provinces and the other of the

predominantly Muslim provinces, dealing with all other subjects which the provinces in the respective groups desire to be dealt with in common. The Provincial Governments will deal with all other subjects and will have all residuary sovereign rights."

This matter was to be discussed at Simla and we agreed to attend the conference on Sunday, 5th May, 1946, on the terms of my letter, dated 28th April, 1946.

You were good enough to explain your formula and then after hours of discussion on the 5th and 6th of May, the Congress finally and definitely turned down the proposed Union confined only to three subjects even with power to levy contribution for financing the Union.

Next, your formula clearly envisaged an agreement precedent between the Congress and the Muslim League with regard to the grouping of Muslim and Hindu provinces and the formation of two Federations of the grouped provinces and it followed that there must be two constitution-making machineries. It was on that basis that some kind of Union was suggested in your formula confined only to three subjects and our approval was sought in order to put into this skeleton blooded and flesh.

This proposal was also categorically turned down by the Congress and the meeting had to be adjourned for the Mission to consider the matter

further as to what steps they may take in the matter.

And now the new enclosed document has been sent to us with a view that "this paper should be discussed at the next meeting to be held on Thursday afternoon at 3 p.m." The heading of the paper is "Suggested points for agreement between the representatives of the Congress and the Muslim League." By whom are they suggested, it is not made clear.

We are of the opinion that the new suggested points for agreement are a fundamental departure from the original formula embodied in your letter of 27th April, which was rejected by the Congress.

To mention some of the important points we are now asked to agree that there should be one All-India Union Government in terms of paragraphs 1—7 of this paper, which adds one more subject to be vested in the Union Government, i.e. "Fundamental Rights" and it is not made clear whether the Union Government and Legislature will have power or not to obtain for itself the finances by means of taxation.

In the new "suggestions" the question of grouping of provinces is left exactly as the Congress spokesmen desired in the course of discussions that have taken place hitherto, and is totally different from your original formula.

That there should be a single constitution-making body, we can never agree to; nor can we agree to the method of formation of constitution-making machineries suggested in the paper.

There are many other objectionable features contained in the suggestions which we have not dealt with as we are only dealing with the main points arising out of this paper. In these circumstances, we think, no useful purpose will be served to discuss this paper as it is a complete departure from your original formula, unless after what we have said above, you still desire us to discuss it in the conference itself tomorrow.

Letter from Lord Pethick-Lawrence to the President of the Muslim League, dated 9th May, 1946.

I have to acknowledge your letter of yesterday which I have shown to my colleagues. In it you raise a number of issues to which I propose to reply in order.

1. You claim that Congress "finally and definitely turned down the proposed Union confined only to three subjects even with power to levy contribution for financing the Union." This statement is not in accord with my recollection of what took place in the conference room. It is true that the Congress representatives expressed their view that the limitation was too narrow and argued further that even so limited it necessarily included certain ancillary matters. Up to a point you re-

cognised that there was some force in the argument because you agreed, as I understood, that some power to obtain the necessary finance must be given. there was no final decision on this matter (or of course on any other).

2. Next you claim, if I understand you aright, that our reference to the formation of groups is at variance with the formula in our invitation. I am afraid I cannot accept this view. It is of course, a slightly amplified form because it specifies the manner in which the provinces can decide as to joining any particular group. This amplified form is put forward by us as a reasonable compromise between the views of the Muslim League and those originally expressed by Congress against grouping at all.

3. You further take exception to the machinery that we suggest should be set up for making the constitution. I would point out to you, however, that you yourself in explaining how your two constitution-making bodies would work agreed on Tuesday last, in the conference that they would have to join together in the end to decide the constitution of the Union and you took no exception to their having a preliminary session in common to decide procedure. What we are proposing is in fact precisely the same thing expressed in different words. I am, therefore, quite at a loss to understand what you have in mind when you use the words "this proposal was also categorically turned down by the Congress."

4. In your next succeeding paragraph you ask who it is that makes the suggestions that are contained in the document I sent you. The answer is the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy who make them in our endeavour to bridge the gap between the viewpoints of the Congress and the Muslim League.

5. You next take exception to our departing from the original formula in my invitation. I would remind you that in accepting my original invitation neither the Muslim League nor the Congress bound itself to accept in full the original formula, and in my reply of April 29, I wrote these words:

"We have never contemplated that acceptance by the Muslim League and the Congress of our invitation would imply as a preliminary condition full approval by them of the terms set out in my letter. These terms are our proposed basis for a settlement and what we have asked the Muslim League Working Committee to do is to agree to send its representatives to meet ourselves and representatives of the Congress in order to discuss it.'

Indeed this is the only sensible attitude because the object of all our discussions is to explore every conceivable possibility of reaching agreement.

6. "Fundamental Rights" were included by us in our suggestions for addition to the list of Union subjects because it seemed to us that it would be of benefit both to the large communities and to

the small minorities for them to be put in and accordingly to be worthy of consideration in our conference. As to finance, it will of course be quite open to discuss in the conference the precise significance of the inclusion of this word in its context.

7. Your two following paragraphs are mainly a recapitulation of your previous arguments and have been already dealt with above.

From your last paragraph I understand that though you do not consider in the circumstances that any good purpose would be served by the attendance of the Muslim League Delegation at the conference fixed for this afternoon, you are willing to come if we express a desire that you should do so. My colleagues and I wish to obtain the views of both parties on the document submitted and therefore, would be glad to see you at the Conference

Memorandum by the President of the Muslim League embodying Minimum demands by way of an offer, in accordance with the Conference decision, dated 12th May, 1946.

PRINCIPLES TO BE AGREED TO AS OUR OFFER.

1. The six Muslim-Provinces (Punjab, N.W. F.P., Baluchistan, Sind, Bengal and Assam) shall be grouped and will deal with all other subjects and

matters except Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications necessary for Defence, which may be dealt with by the constitution-making bodies of the two groups of provinces-Muslim provinces (hereinafter named Pakistan Group) and Hindu provinces—sitting together.

2. There shall be a separate constitution-making body for the six Muslim provinces named above, which will frame constitutions for the group and the provinces in the group and will determine the list of subjects that shall be Provincial and Central (of the Pakistan Federation) with residuary sovereign powers vesting in the provinces.

3. The method of election of the representatives to the constitution-making body will be such as would secure proper representation to the various communities in proportion to their population in each province of the Pakistan Group.

4. After the constitutions of the Pakistan Federal Government and the provinces are finally framed by the constitution-making body, it will be open to any province of the group to decide to opt out of its group, provided the wishes of the people of that province are ascertained by a referendum to opt out or not.

5. It must be open to discussion in the joint constitution-making body as to whether the Union will have a Legislature or not. The method of providing the Union with finance should also be left for decision of the joint meeting of the two

constitution-making bodies but in no event shall it be by means of taxation.

6. There should be parity of representation between the two group of provinces in the Union Executive and the Legislature, if any.

7. No major point in the Union constitution which affects the communal issue shall be deemed to be passed in the joint constitution-making body, unless the majority of the members of the constitution-making body, of the Hindu provinces and the majority of the members of the constitution-making body of the Pakistan Group, present and voting, are separately in its favour.

8. No decision, legislative, executive or administrative, shall be taken by the Union in regard to any matter of controversial nature, except by a majority of three-fourths.

9. In group and provincial constitution fundamental rights and safeguards concerning religion, culture and other matters of the different communities will be provided for.

10. The constitution of the Union shall contain a provision whereby any province can, by a majority vote of its Legislative Assembly call for reconsideration of the terms of the Constitution, and will have the liberty to secede from the Union at any time after an initial period of ten years.

These are the principles of our offer for a peaceful and amicable settlement and this offer stands in its entirety and all matters mentioned herein are interdependent.

* * *

ABDUL QAYYUM KHAN

Letter from Mr. Abdul Qayyum Khan, dated Lucknow, August 16, 1945:

Respected Quaid -i-Azam,

I am here on a professional visit. I expect to be here till 25-8-1945, when I shall leave for Peshawar, and hope to be there on 27-8-1945. I beg to communicate to you what I consider to be the most momentous decision of my life. This is the result of anxious heart-searching and hard thinking for days on end.

I have decided to join the Muslim League.

I believe that the stand taken by you is absolutely correct and that any Muslim who opposes you is betraying the cause of Islam in India.

I am now awaiting your order and will do as I am told—Yours sincerely, Abdul Qayyum.

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah, dated Bombay, August 20, 1945:

Your letter of Aug. 16. Many thanks. I am glad to note your decision to join the League. I appreciate your views, frankly expressed in your letter. No room or place for any honest Muslim in the Congress or support to it, at any rate, after the Simla Conference. I hope others will follow your example and join our national organisation, the All-India Muslim League, especially at this critical juncture and serve selflessly the national cause of Muslim India and that Islam stands for.—Jinnah.

* * *

C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR

1943

Cable of Rajaji:

Dated, February 12, 1943.

"The pursuance of general desire to consider the situation arising Gandhiji's fast earnestly request you to join conference here on 18th Thursday afternoon Kunzru Ghuznavi Srinivasan. Joshi, Kazmi, Banerjee, Chowdhary, Sant Singh and selves convening Reply Birla House."

Reply of Quaid -i-Azam.

"I received your telegram yesterday the 14th and beg to inform you that the situation arising

out of Mr. Gandhi's fast is really a matter for the Hindu leaders to consider and advise him accordingly.

I regret I am unable to associate myself with the proposed conference at Delhi on the 18th of February 1943; for it is apparent from the recent correspondence between the Viceroy, the Government of India and Mr. Gandhi that has been published in the press, that there is no change on the part of Mr. Gandhi in the attitude and stand taken by him last August vis-a-vis the Muslim League, except the reiteration of his oft-repeated political demand, having for its sanction a threat to resort to "mass civil disobedience."

Now he has undertaken this dangerous fast with a view to enforce that demand, which if conceded or agreed to under such coercive method, it is obvious, will destroy the Muslim demand and involve complete sacrifice of the vital and paramount interests of Muslim India.

Moreover, great political issues and complex political problems of this sub-continent, involving the destinies of millions, cannot be settled or solved by means and methods of fasting adopted by Mr. Gandhi. Besides owing to previous engagement it is not possible for me to go to Delhi on the 18th of February, 1943.

I do, however, hope that your efforts may lead to the path of reason and peace and then there would come an opportunity for friendly negotia-

tions which might, I trust, result in a settlement satisfactory not only to the two major nations—Hindus and Muslims, but to all other interests and minorities, concerned."

Letter from Mr. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

New Delhi,

April 8, 1944.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Here is the basis for a settlement which I discussed with Gandhiji in March 1943, and of which he expressed full approval. He then authorized me to signify his approval of these terms should I be able to convince you of their being just and fair to all. As the Government have refused to relax any of the restrictions imposed on him to enable him to discuss or negotiate terms of any settlement, I write this to you on his behalf and hope that this will bring about a final settlement of the most unfortunate impasse we are in. You are aware of the intensity of my desire for a settlement. I was very glad when I found it possible to obtain Gandhiji's approval of these terms. I hope that you will bestow your fullest thought on the justice and fairness of these proposals and help to terminate a condition of affairs which is steadily causing all-round deterioration in the country.

Yours Sincerely,

C. Rajagopalachari

ENCLOSURE

"Basis for terms of settlement between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League to which Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah agree and which they will endeavour respectively to get the Congress and the League to approve:

(1) Subject to the terms set out below as regards the constitution for Free India, the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for Independence and will co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a provisional interim Government for the transitional period.

(2) After the termination of the war, a commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in the north-west and east of India, wherein the Muslim population is in absolute majority. In the areas thus demarcated, a plebiscite of all the inhabitants held on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindustan. If the majority decide in favour of forming a sovereign State separate from Hindustan, such decision shall be given effect to, without prejudice to the right of districts on the border to choose to join either State.

(3) It will be open to all parties to advocate their points of view before the plebiscite is held.

(4) In the event of separation mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence, and commerce and communications and for other essential purposes.

(5) Any transfer of population shall only be on an absolutely voluntary basis.

(6) These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility of the governance of India."

Letter from Mr. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

New Delhi.

April 17, 1944.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The proposal I gave you in writing when we last met in Delhi must be still with you and perhaps you have read it over again and given further thought to it. I was much disappointed, as you are aware, at your inability to approve of the terms. But I hope you may perhaps reconsider your position. I sincerely believe that the proposals form a fair and satisfactory basis of settlement. I shall be grateful to hear from you as to whether you have reconsidered the matter.

Yours Sincerely,

C. Rajagopalachari.

Telegram from Mr. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

Poona, June 30, 1944.

Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, Guest House, Srinagar.

My letter dated April 17, touching matter personally discussed on April 8 remains yet unanswered. Have now met Gandhiji who still holds by formula presented to you by me. I would like now publish the formula and your rejection. This telegram is sent with Gandhiji's approval. I would like you at this juncture to reconsider your rejection.

C. Rajagopalachari.

Dilkusha, Panchgani.

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Rajagopalachari.

SRINAGAR, July 2, 1944.

Mr. Rajagopalachari, Dilkusha, Panchgani.

Your request to publish your formula. Your wrong version our talk that I rejected your formula is unfair surprising. True facts are I was willing place your formula before Working Committee Muslim League although it was not open to any modification but you did not agree allow me to do so. Hence no further step was taken. My reaction was that I could not personally take responsibility of accepting or rejecting it and my position

remains same today. If Mr. Gandhi even now sends me direct his proposal I am willing place it before Muslim League Working Committee.

M. A. JINNAH.

Telegram from Mr. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

PANCHGANI, July 4, 1944.

Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah, Guest House, Srinagar.

Thanks telegram. My letter April 17 showed how I felt over what I thought was rejection of formula so far as you were personally concerned. Shall be glad indeed if as your telegram suggests you did not reject it. Gandhiji, though not vested with representative or special authority in this matter definitely approved my proposal and authorized me to approach you on that basis. Now again he reaffirms his assent. Weight of his opinion would most probably secure Congress acceptance. You were unwilling to accept my formula, but were willing to place it before League Council. I think no purpose served by such procedure so long as it does not have your own support.

C. Rajagopalachari.

Dilkusha, Panchgani.

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Rajagoplachari.

SRINAGAR, July 5, 1944.

Mr. Rajagopalachari, Dilkusha, Panchgani.

Regret unable to go beyond my telegram July 2.

M. A. JINNAH.

Telegram from Mr. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

PANCHGANI, July 8, 1944.

Mr. Jinnah, Guest House, Srinagar.

Your telegram of 5th received today. With it private negotiation ends. It is necessary take public into confidence now. I am accordingly releasing entire correspondence ending your wire 5th.

C. Rajagopalachari.

* * *

E. V. RAMASWAMI

Letter from Mr. Ramaswami, dated Erode August 9, 1944.

My dear Jinnah Sahib,

I have been watching carefully the proceedings of Mr. Rajagopalacharia's fromula towards solving

the deadlock and your desire to receive Mr. Gandhi at your residence in Bombay on your return, which will probably be about the middle of August. It is welcomed in poltical circles.

Though I have no full hope, there are signs of change as our opponents have come forward themselves to settle the Hindu-Muslim question, especially in relation to the Cripps offer. I need not say that Congressites are experts in twisting words and to give occult sense. They can say anything and give meanings in whatever manner they think. Though we do not depend upon them, you know very well that we should be vigilant and careful in the negotiation.

It is clear that a general election with Muslims and Hindus as well as Aryans and Dravidians will give hardship to both of us.

Kindly excuse me for reminding you about our discussions relating to Pakistan and Dravidastan while we were at Madras and Delhi, and your assurance that you would plead for both questions as one. Here in South India, I considered both the questions as one and did my best to solve the problem as far as possible.

You know very well that there could be no Pakistan and independence for Muslim India until and unless independence was achieved for the rest of the nations.

With kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,

E.V. Ramaswami.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah.

Bombay,

Dated August 17, 1944.

Dear Mr. Ramaswami,

I am in receipt of your letter of August 9, and thank you for it. I have always had much sympathy for the people of Madras, 90 per cent of whom are Non-Brahmins, and if they desire to establish their Dravidastan, it is entirely for your people to decide on this matter. I can say no more, and certainly I cannot speak on your behalf.

I have made the position clear to you and your colleagues when I was in Madras more than once, but hitherto I have noticed that in your activities you have been indecisive. If the people of your province really desire Dravidastan, then it is for them to assert themselves. I hope that you will understand my position, that I can only speak for Muslim India, but you have my assurance that wherever and whenever I have a say in the matter, you will find me supporting any just and fair claim or demand of any section of the people of India, and particularly the Non-Brahmins of Southern India.

Yours Sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

SAPRU—JINNAH CORRESPONDENCE—1944

Letter of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru dated 10th December, 1944.

As you may be aware, the Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference met at Delhi on the 18th and 19th of November last, and passed a resolution, in accordance with which I made a statement at a Press Conference on the 19th of November, 1944. I am enclosing herewith a printed copy of the resolution and a summary of my statement. Accordingly, a Committee has been appointed and the names of its members have appeared in the press. It will soon begin to function.

The main function of the Committee is exploratory. It will endeavour, by personal contacts and otherwise, to ascertain the views of the main political parties in regard to the basis of the future Constitution of India. It will study carefully the full implications of the proposals of the Muslim League in regard to Pakistan as well as the full import of the proposals made by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. C. Rajagopalachari during the recent Gandhi—Jinnah talks. It will study with no less care the demand of the Hindu Mahasabha, of the

Sikhs, of the Scheduled Classes and other important bodies. The Committee hopes that by a thorough and unbiased examination of these conflicting views, it may find it possible to make concrete suggestions which may pave the way for solution of the present controversies.

I am, therefore, earnestly approaching you, on behalf of the Committee and on my own behalf, to enquire if you will kindly allow me and one or two other members of the Committee to see you in order to obtain clarification on the practical aspects of the problem. I shall, therefore, be much obliged if you would kindly fix two alternative dates that may suit you and also let me know the place where we can meet you.

Reply of Mr. Jinnah dated 14th December, 1944.

I am in receipt of your letter dated December 10th, enclosing therein a printed copy of the resolution passed by the Standing Committee on the 18th and 19th of November last, and also a summary of your statement at the Press Conference of the 19th ultimo, and I thank you for them.

I regret to say that I cannot recognize the Non-Party Conference or its Standing Committee, and it follows therefore, that I cannot recognize the Committee recently appointed by the Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference for the purpose and the manner in which you propose to proceed and deal with the present political situation. My views about your Non-Party are already well-

known to you and the public. In these circumstances, I am unable to comply with the request contained in your letter.

However, I hope that you will understand that I do not mean any discourtesy to you personally, and that had you desired to meet me otherwise than on behalf of the Non-Party Conference or the Committee referred to in your letter, I would have been glad to see you.

Letter from Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, dated 17th December, 1944.

This is simply to acknowledge your letter of the 14th of December, which I received yesterday (16) evening. One day prior to the receipt of your letter, i.e., on the 15th, I had heard from some press correspondents here that my letter and your letter only confirmed what I had heard already before its arrival.

I note that you are unable to see me on behalf of the Non-Party Conference or the Committee which has been appointed by it.

I presume you will have no objection to my issuing this letter to the press.

* * * * *

BEGUM SHAH NAWAZ

BEGUM SHAH NAWAZ

October, 1945.

"After reading your clarion call to Muslim to rally round the Muslim League banner at this critical juncture in the history of Muslim India I venture to place my services at your disposal and request you to be so kind as to remove the ban imposed on me in 1941. May 1 be permitted to serve the Muslim League as your humble soldier, as I have already explained to you at length the circumstances that were responsible for my committing the blunder of 1941. I have tendered my apology in person. I would like to assure you once again that in future I shall consider it my proud privilege to carry out the orders of my leader to the best of my ability and shall serve the organisation that I love wholeheartedly and faithfully.

Quaid-i-Azam's reply—

"I accept your explanation and assurances and appreciate the spirit of your letter. I therefore, as requested by you in the circumstances shall remove the ban which was imposed on you in 1941, for five years disqualifying you for membership of

the Muslim League and I do hope you will serve selflessly and loyally the Muslim League and our nation for the achievement of Pakistan.

* * *

SHAH NAWAZ KHAN

Letter from Mr. Shah Nawaz Khan to Mr. Jinnah dated November 13, 1946:

Dear Sir,

On November 11, hearing the disturbances and destruction of life and property that were going on in the area between Ghaziabad and Hapur, I visited the area accompanied by Miss Mridula Sarabhai and some other friends. There were some very regrettable touching scenes, into the details of which I shall not go. We went into the villages of Dasna and Mussorie, which were predominantly Muslim with a few Hindu inhabitants.

The police tried to prevent us from going there, telling us that if we went there we would be killed. All the same we went in on our own responsibility. On going into the village we found that the great majority of the Muslims had collected all the Hindus in one place and were giving them full protection. They had also taken the Hindu women together with their own womenfolk, to places of safety.

I talked to one of them, who said that in spite of the ruthless destruction of their lives and property in all areas around, they were going to protect the lives, honour and property of the minority amongst them, because this was the instruction from the Quaid-i-Azam.

The local Muslim population said that they knew that the barbarities were not committed by the local people, but by pilgrims from outside, mainly from Rohtak and Hissar, incited by the R.S.S. and other communalists.

I would request you to issue frequent appeals and send Muslim League workers into the area predominantly Muslim to take the responsibility of protecting the life, honour and property of the minority. I am also making a similar appeal to the Congress to send prominent workers to areas that are predominantly Hindu, to take the responsibility of protecting the lives, honour and property of the Muslim minority.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Shah Nawaz dated November 14, 1946:

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter of November 13, 1946, and I thank you for the information and advice you have given me.

SHIA POLITICAL CONFERENCE 1944

Syed Ali Zaheer's letter dated July 25, 1944—

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

In view of your letter addressed to S. Sakhi Husain of Amroha published in the Press and your reference to the Shia Community in your speech at Sialkot, I was required by the last meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference to approach you and to request you to elucidate and define the status of the Shias in the scheme of Pakistan, as proposed by the Muslim League. The necessity for this step has been felt because of the following among other circumstances:—

Several attempts have been made to propose from the Muslim League platform that the Government in the Pakistan should be modelled on the lines of the Government that prevailed, in Arabia just after the Prophet's death, (i.e. Hukumul Illahiya). Although it is realised that it is not possible to put the clock back by so many years, yet it is feared that this may be an attempt to curtail the freedom of religious rights and observances which has been enjoyed by the Shia heretofore.

(b) During elections for Muslim seats, it is a very common experience of a Shia candidate, whenever he is pitched against a Sunni candidate, to find that appeal is made to the religious fanaticism

of the majority of voters, and a Shia is defeated merely because he is a Shia. It is a common practice on such occasion to allege that a Shia, because of certain peculiarities of his articles of faith, is not a Muslim at all, and as such not entitled to their votes.

(c) The bitter experience which the Shias had during the regime of the Congress in U.P. of the two Congress Muslim Ministers makes them unwilling to trust themselves in future, to similar type of Muslim Ministers. They are afraid that although in Pakistan Provinces there will be no Congress Ministeries, yet the men who will form the Cabinet may be of the same class and type.

(b) The Shia Political Conference gives considerable importance to its creed of complete independence for India and desires to carry on the struggle for it side by side with other political bodies in the country which have the same creed. The Shias are convinced that with the freedom of the country Pakistan will also be automatically achieved if majority of the Mussalmans so desire.

Although I have no final authority on behalf of the Shias generally, I feel that if the Muslim League gives them the following assurances they will feel perfectly satisfied.

(1) That there will be no encroachment on their religious freedom and observances in Pakistan, and no innovations which will hurt their religious susceptibilities will be inflicted.

(2) That during elections there should be propaganda directly against the religious beliefs or practices of a Shia, and if there is any such propaganda then irrespective of the proof whether it has affected the result of the election or not, the election will be set aside at the instance of the Shia candidate. It may be necessary to give a guarantee that the election rules will be amended to give effect to this assurance.

(3) That the Shias should be guaranteed sufficient number of seats in the Ministries. Legislatures, and all the elected bodies, as well as to all Judicial and Executive posts which should be a definite proportion of the Muslims who are appointed to these places. The proportion must necessarily vary in different Provinces, and will have to be fixed in consultation, with the representatives of the Shias in these Provinces.

(4) That the Muslim League, while fighting for Pakistan, will struggle for the independence of the country as a whole, and should be willing to settle its differences with other political parties, in order that the movement for the freedom of the country may not be jeopardised. It should be realised that insistence on the attainment of Pakistan first, is likely to delay considerably both Pakistan and Independence.

I may mention in the end according to me these are the most important points which have so far kept the Shia Political Conference and the majority

of the Shias outside the Muslim League. I hope that as soon as a satisfactory understanding is arrived at on these questions there will probably be no difficulty left in two bodies working in harmony with each other.

Yours Sincerely,

ALI ZAHEER

President, All-India Shia
Political Conference

Quaid-i-Azam's reply—

Malabar Hill,
BOMBAY, 31st August, 1944.

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter of July 25th, and I regret I cannot discuss the points raised by you through and by means of correspondence. I enclose herewith a copy of a Press report of my interview with a deputation of the Shias of the Punjab dated March 30th for your information. I am confident that the majority of Shias are with the Muslim League and such of them as are still outside the League under some sort of misapprehension, are, in my opinion unwise in not joining the Muslim League without any reservation in the interests of the Shias as well as of Muslim India

generally. The Muslim League stands for justice and fairplay, and will always stand for these fundamental principles, and there is no need for the Shias to think that they will not be justly treated by the All-India Muslim League. I think it is a great disservice to the Muslim cause to create any kind of division between the Mussalmans of India, and I do not see any real cause or occasion for it. Our organisation is now in a position to meet out justice to every individual and recognise the merits wherever we have any voice or power to do so and as time goes on it will grow more and more in that direction. The Muslim League cannot recognise any other political organisation. Besides, most of the points that you have raised are matters for the Mussalmans themselves to deal with internally and some of them are totally irrelevant and are raised under a misapprehension and not in accordance with facts.

Yours faithfully,

M. A. JINNAH.

1945

Cable from the Secretary of the Shia Conference Lucknow dated 3rd October, 1945—

"Our invitation for the Shia All-Party Conference is issued. Leaders' presence urgently needed. Wire consent. Sajjad Ali Khan."

Quaid-i-Azam's reply—

"Your telegram. The organisers of the Shia Conference, I regret to say, are misguided and misled by our enemies. My advice to every Shia is to join the Muslim League unreservedly at this critical juncture. The other course is harmful generally to the Muslims of India and even more detrimental to the Shia interests."

"The Muslim League and I have made it clear repeatedly that we stand for justice and fairplay towards every sect of Mussalmans and non-Muslim minorities. The Muslim League is already pledged to its basic principle of freedom for all religions and sects. The Muslim League will never interfere with the faith and belief of any sect amongst Mussalmans or non-Muslims and minorities. On the contrary, the cardinal and fundamental principles of the Muslim League laid down in the Lahore resolutions of March, 1940, in clear terms, provides for effective safeguards and the protection of minorities and their religious rights of freedom. An overwhelming majority of Shias are with the League and legitimate grievances, if any, are a matter of our own internal concern, and can be dealt within our fold by the All-India Muslim League."

* * *

VITHALBHAI—JINNAH

In 1929 Vithalbhai Patel, as President of the Indian Legislative Assembly, approached Lord Irwin

and impressed upon him the need of calling a Round Table Conference. Irwin showed his willingness to pursue the idea, provided he was assured of the support of the most of the responsible leaders. He opened conversations with Sapru and Jinnah on one side, and with Motilal and Gandhi on the other. Vithalbhai acted as the intermediary. On 31st October, 1929, Irwin made the press announcement indicating that before the Report of Simon Commission was presented, a conference should be set up in which His Majesty's Government should meet Indian representatives to seek greatest possible measurement of agreement on the proposals, later, to be submitted to Parliament. A group of politicians including Gandhi and members of the Congress Working Committee, on the one hand and Jinnah and Malaviya on the other, met at Delhi early in November to consider the Viceroy's declaration. A joint manifesto was issued, welcoming on the whole the issue of the British Government to palacate Indian opinion.

Mr. Jinnah and Vithalbhai Patel had a long talk with Mr. Gandhi on 30th November, 1929, at the Sabarmati Ashram and it was settled that the leaders should meet the Viceroy on 23rd December. Following letters between Vithalbhai and Irwin give the background—

20, Akbar Road,
New Delhi, 11th December, 1929.

My dear Lord Irwin,

As I am anxious that I should not be mis-

understood, I write this to Your Excellency on a matter on which I feel my silence might cause some misunderstanding.

You are already aware that I and Mr. Jinnah had a long talk with Gandhi on the 30th of November last, at the Sabarmati Ashram. That meeting was brought about by me at the desire of Mr. Jinnah. It was settled at the meeting that Gandhi, Motilal, Sapru, Jinnah and myself should meet you at the Viceregal Lodge, Delhi, on the 23rd of December, that Gandhi should write to Motilal to agree to the arrangement and on hearing from Gandhi that Motilal has so agreed, I should address a letter requesting Your Excellency to send out formal invitations to all of us.

Gandhi now writes to me that he has received a telegram from Motilal in reply to this letter that he (Motilal) has already received and accepted an invitation from Your Excellency to meet you on the 23rd of December, and that the idea is to discuss the Congress point of view with Your Excellency with Congressmen alone. In these circumstances, Gandhi adds that it was wholly unnecessary for me to move in the matter. On receipt of this letter, I at once sent a copy of it to Mr. Jinnah and informed him that the arrangement had fallen through.

I cannot help feeling that the plan we had arranged at the Sabarmati Ashram would have been

more effective and in any case, I wish you had invited Gandhi simultaneously with Motilal.

Yours Sincerely,

V. J. Patel.

His Excellency Lord Irwin,
P.C., G.M.S.I., G.M.I.E.,
Viceroy's Camp.

Viceroy's reply—

The Viceroy's House,
New Delhi, 16th December, 1929.

Dear Mr. Patel,

His Excellency desires me to communicate to you the following message from him:

"I have just received your letter dated the 11th instant. I am mystified by passage therein saying that Motilal already received and accepted invitation from me to come and see me on December 23rd, and that the idea is for me to discuss matters with Congressmen alone. This is entirely at variance with position as I know it. This was explained in a letter I wrote to Sapru on December 3rd, repeating what I had said to Jinnah in Bombay

to the effect that I should be glad to meet Gandhi, Jinnah, Motilal and Sapru in Delhi if they desired. I added that in view of events both in England and here it would help me greatly if the suggestion of such a meeting could come from those desiring to see me. In course of (a) letter to you despatched (on the) 14th of December, from Madras I mentioned that I had (a) letter from Jinnah last week saying that you might be writing to me about (the) possibility of my seeing Gandhi, yourself and others and I added that of course I was always ready to see any of the leaders who might express (a) desire to see me. I also mentioned my intention, if (the) meeting took place of making some sort of announcement to the effect that intimation had been made to me while on tour that Gandhi, Motilal, Sapru and Jinnah would be glad of (an) opportunity of placing me in possession of their views and that I had accordingly invited them to meeting. Tendencious report recently appearing in Press that I was calling a Conference of Congress Leaders will render some such statement essential, and what I propose takes account of difficulties on both sides. In view of (the)importance of clearing (the) misunderstanding. I should be grateful if you would take steps to clear the situation with Motilal and let me know how the misunderstanding has arisen. I am communicating in sense (of?) this telegram with (to) Jinnah."

Yours Sincerely,

Griffin.

However, the meeting at the Viceregal Lodge Delhi took place on 23rd December, but ended in a deadlock as a result of the intrigues of the two Nehrus and Gandhi. The circumstances are narrated in details by G.I. Patel in Vithalbhai Patel—Life and Times—with a forward by M.C. Chagla. The following extract sums up the situation :—

"Vithalbhai had succeeded in bringing Jinnah and Gandhi together at Sabarmati, where they had evolved the greatest common measure of agreement to be discussed with Irwin. The Viceroy on his part had preferred to meet Gandhiji, Motilal, Jinnah, Sapru and Vithalbhai together. Vithalbhai was entrusted with the work of fixing up the arrangement. But the whole move was threatened from an unexpected quarter. Somehow Motilal got the impression that he alone was to meet Irwin and acquaint him with the Congress view-point. It was only a personal talk between Motilalji and Vithabhai, and the tact of Sapru that ultimately cleared up the misunderstanding. And it appeared for a moment that things might be all right in the end.

The interview was to take place on the 23rd of December, 1929, when the Viceroy was scheduled to return to Delhi after his protracted tour in South India. During the interval much water had flown down the Ganges. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President-designate of the Congress, was definitely against any settlement such as was visualised by Motilalji himself, unless the Government were prepared to release every political prisoner and to give irrevocable pledge that Dominion Status would

be granted at once. Motilalji was conciliatory in the meeting of leaders at Allahabad, and so was Gandhiji. As President of the All-India Federation of Trades Union at Nagpur, Jawaharlal declared his revolt, about the middle of December, against the possibility of any settlement by negotiations. It was apparent from the attitude taken up by him, which was backed up by all the younger and the more radical elements in the country, that a split was inevitable in the Congress ranks. Could Motilalji, face such a situation? It was by no means easy for him to do so, as in that event he had not only to fight his own son, but also all the radical elements in the Congress. On his return from Nagpur, Jawaharlal prepared his speech for the Lahore Congress, and he showed it to Motilalji. How Motilalji reacted to it at the time has not been known, but it appears that, for all practical purposes, a definite change took place in his attitude from that moment. He was of course in close touch with Gandhiji and it was evident that they had come to a clear decision about what they should do at the Viceroy's interview, on the 23rd of December. The conclusions which they had reached were treated as a close secret and were not communicated to Vithalbhai or to Sapru or to Jinnah, all of whom were there, in Delhi, on the 23rd, for the interview.

Irwin returned to Delhi, as arranged, on the 23rd morning. Although a dastardly attempt was made on that day to bomb the Viceroy's train by some fanatics near Delhi, Irwin who had escaped death, as if, by a miracle, proceeded unmoved to the Viceregal Lodge, received the leaders and was

prepared for the interview. Irwin was enthusiastic about its outcome, and in anticipation had even prepared a list of certain political prisoners who were to be immediately released. Unfortunately, however, Gandhiji declared, at the very outset, that unless the Viceroy was prepared to give a pledge that the Round Table Conference would recommend nothing short of full Dominion Status, and to assure him that the said pledge would be honoured by the British Government, he did not see any useful purpose in carrying on any further talks. Irwin was dumb-founded at this bolt from the blue. Vithalbhai, Sapru and Jinnah also were stunned at this sudden and, at the same time, inexplicable change in the attitude taken up by Gandhiji and Motilalji. Immediately it became clear that both Gandhiji and Motilalji had come prepared to give a short shrift to the interview.

A great opportunity for a settlement by negotiations was thus lost once again. One wonders why Gandhiji and Motilalji had ever entertained any proposal for an interview if they were not prepared to discuss the matter unless an understanding was given, at the very outset, by Irwin himself who obviously did not have the power of committing the British Parliament in advance. He could only make some recommendations, and the chances were that the British statesmen concerned would have preferred being guided by the conclusion of the man on the spot. The real beneficiary of this disastrous result was Pandit Jawahalal Nehru inasmuch as he could now claim to be the President of an undivided Congress. Gandhiji and Motilalji

had their personal prestige and popularity enhanced. Vithalbhai alone found himself in a very embarrassing position at the sudden turn which the events had taken. All his efforts to bring the leaders and the Viceroy together, with a view to reaching a political settlement in the country dashed ignominiously to the ground. If he had initiated this move, he had also kept the leaders concerned informed of all the developments from time to time. But Motilalji and Gandhiji, who had acquiesced in it, did not care to take him into confidence when they changed their attitude, and thought it fit to torpedo that well-laid plan without so much as a thought for what the engineer of that plan might feel."

CORRESPONDENCE

20, Akbar Road,

New Delhi, 10th December, 1929.

My dear Jinnah,

I have received Mahatmaji's letter from Wardha in which he says that Motilalji wires to him that he has already received and also accepted invitation from the Viceroy to meet him on the 23rd. Gandhiji further says that it was under the circumstances unnecessary for us to move any further in the matter. He has given his reasons for this view in his letter a copy of which I enclose herewith to avoid any misunderstanding.

I still think our plan was much better. In auy case, I cannot admire the wisdom of Lord Irwin in inviting Motilalji without simultaneously inviting Gandhiji. I only hope the meeting will bring the Congress and the Government nearer.

Yours Sincerely,

V. J. Patel.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Esqr.,
Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill, Bombay.

* * *

JINNAH TO VITHALBHAI

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill, Bombay,

14th December, 1929.

Dear Mr. Patel,

I received your letter with the enclosure. Many thanks. I think it is just as well that Motilal is going to see His Excellency on the 23rd of December, by himself. There are many reasons why I say so, although the other course would perhaps have been far more advantageous and more effective. However, let us wait and see.

Yours Sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

VITHALBHAI TO JINNAH

20, Akbar Road,
New Delhi, 18th December, 1929.

My dear Jinnah,

Motilal saw me today and explained how misunderstanding had arisen. The accompanying copy of the telegram which I have today sent to His Excellency speaks for itself. You will thus see that our original arrangement stands and the Viceroy will in a day or two send out telegraphic invitations to five of us. You must, therefore, hold yourself in readiness to be here on the 22nd. Gandhi, Motilal and Sapru will also be here on the 22nd. More when we meet.

Yours Sincerely,

V. J. Patel.

M.A. Jinnah, Esqr., Bar-at-Law, M.L.A.,
High Court, Bombay.

* * *

VITHALBHAI'S TELEGRAM TO IRWIN

His Excellency Lord Irwin,
Viceroy's Camp.

Seen Motilal who says he has not seen your letter of third December to Sapru but Sapru's first

suggestion to you to meet Motilal was the result of conversation between Sapru and Motilal in course of which Motilal accepted Sapru's advice to discuss Congress point of view with you if invited by you Stop On receipt of your reply Sapru phoned to him at Lucknow that you should be glad to see him on 15th of November and that Motilal was to treat your letter to Sapru as an invitation Stop Sapru informed you that Motilal was unable to get away from Lucknow to meet you on 15th at Lucknow saying that you hoped to meet him on 23rd of December Stop There was no mention of any other person seeing you with Motilal and he remained under the impression that he alone would do so Stop He suggested to Sapru on Moday last that Gandhi may be invited to meet you with him and Sapru agreeing wrote and wired to you yesterday to that effect Stop Sapru saw Motilal yesterday just before latter left Allahabad and said nothing to remove Motilal's impression Stop Motilal believes that Sapru himself thought that you will meet him and Gandhi separately from Sapru and Jinnah Stop He therefore concluded that you intended to discuss Congress point of view with him and Gandhi alone Stop He regrets misunderstanding and says he has no objection if you also invite Sapru, Jinnah and President Patel to meet you at the same hour on the 23rd but does not wish it to be understood that the idea of interviewing you originated with him but that on Sapru's suggestion he agreed to do so if invited Stop In view of all this I would advise you to send telegraphic invitation to all accordingly Stop Gandhi observe silence on 23rd but he would break it at three o'clock Stop I there-

fore suggest that meeting should be after that hour Stop He is at Wardha and arrives here on 22nd Stop Motilal will be in Lahore care of Congress Stop With regard to proposed announcement I suggest the following draft with the approval of Motilal—His Excellency having received intimation whilst on tour that Gandhi, Motilal, Jinnah and President Patel would be glad if invited to meet him and place him in possession of their views on the announcement regarding the proposed conference in London has accordingly invited them to a meeting at Viceroy's House. New Delhi on the 23rd of December Stop Motilal has seen his telegram."

V. J. Patel

Telegram from Lord Wavell dated New Delhi, June 14 :

I hope you have heard my broadcast this evening. The text and that of the Secretary of State's simultaneous announcement in Parliament will appear in newspapers tomorrow. I hope you will agree to attend the conference which I have proposed. I have suggested 11 A.M. on June 25, at Viceregal Lodge, Simla, for first meetings. If you accept my invitation I should welcome a discussion with you before opening conference and suggest subject to your convenience 5 P.M. on June 24, at Viceregal Lodge, Simla. I have had accommodation reserved for you at Cecil Hotel in the hope that you will accept.

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to His Excellency Lord Wavell dated June 15: 1945.

Your invitation of 14th. Shall be glad to meet you on 24th for discussion but as regards your proposals particularly conference, it requires clarifications which I hope will be available in our meeting of 24th. This will enable me consult my Working Committee in the light of such clarifications and decide upon our course of action. May I request you therefore to postpone date of conference for a fortnight as time fixed is too short for meeting Working Committee members all over India. I reciprocate your appeal for co-operation and goodwill and hope that the Muslim League will make its contribution to any just and reasonable interim provisional settlement. Please reply.

Viceroy's telegram, dated 16th June, 1945, to Mr. Jinnah:

I have now received your telegram to me of 15th June. I am grateful for your assurance of co-operation. My broadcast was a very simple statement of the proposals and my intention is to deal at the conference itself with any points requiring clarification. I do not think it advisable to enter into detailed discussions before the conference meets. I would, therefore, prefer to adhere to date for opening of conference on 25th and hope that you will attend. Perhaps you could arrange for your Committee to meet in Simla. I shall look forward to seeing you on 24th. As your

telegram has been published I am sending this to press.

Mr. Jinnah's reply to the Viceroy:

Received your telegram of 16th. I note your intention is to deal at the conference itself with any point requiring clarification. It, therefore, follows that till we have a complete picture of your proposals, as details would be no less vital than the fundamentals, we shall not be able to deal with them. Until I know full details of the scheme and am in a position to place the entire scheme before my Working Committee, it will serve no useful purpose to convene the meeting.

Further I hope that you will understand that calling Working Committee meeting at Simla as suggested by you on or before 25th is fraught with difficulties. First, they will be kept waiting indefinitely till the conference concludes. Second, it would not be easy for me to make arrangements for their suitable accommodation and travel from various provinces within the short time available. However, after my meeting you on 24th for discussion as suggested by you I may be in a better position to understand the situation and arrange things accordingly.

Letter from the Secretary to the Governor-General to Mr. Jinnah, dated June 29th, 1945.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The following is the action which His Excellency would like you to take, if, after consulta-

tion with your Working Committee, you are able to accept the suggestion he made at this morning's meeting of the conference:

(1) To prepare and send him a list giving the names of members of the Muslim League, who in your opinon could suitably be included in the proposed Executive Council. The number of names in this list should be not less than eight or more than twelve.

(2) If you think you can usefully suggest, for possible inclusion in the Executive Council, the names of persons of any community, who are not members of the Muslim League, you are at liberty to add them to your list, keeping them distinct from the names of Muslim League members.

His Excellency hopes he made it clear this morning that this is entirely optional.

His Excellency's intention is to scrutinise the lists sent to him and to see whether from them and possibly from additional names of his own, he can, on paper, form an Executive Council, likely to be acceptable to the parties and to His Majesty's Government. If so, he will consult leaders including yourself, and thereafter decide whether it is worth while making definite proposals to the Conference.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Lord Wavell, dated the 7th July, 1945.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I placed before my Working Committee the

suggestion made by Your Excellency at the last meeting of the conference and to me by your Private Secretary in his letter communicated on the 29th June. The Working Committee after careful consideration desire me to convey to you their views which are:

(1) With regard to your suggestion for submitting a panel of names of the members of the Muslim League for inclusion in the proposed Executive Council, the Working Committee desires to point out that when a similar proposal was made by Your Excellency's predecessor, Lord Linlithgow, in connection with his offer of August, 1940, the Working Committee opposed it and, when its objections were brought to the notice of Lord Linlithgow, he dropped the proposal and suggested another alternative in his letter dated the 25th of September, 1940, addressed to the President of the All-India Muslim League, an extract from which is given below:

"I appreciate, however, the difficulties which you made it clear to me, confronted you in connection with the formulation of the panel which I had earlier suggested to you; and in the light of our discussion I am content that the selection of representatives, while resting with the Governor-General should be based in the case of the Muslim League (and, should they so desire, of the other parties to be represented in my Council) not on a panel formally submitted, but on confidential discussion between the leader of the party concerned and myself."

This alternative was acceptable to the Muslim League. The Working Committee is of the opinion that the procedure settled on the previous occasions should be followed in the present case so far as the Muslim League is concerned.

(2) Further the Working Committee is emphatically of the opinion that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive Council should be chosen from the Muslim League, subject to confidential discussion between your Excellency and the President of the Muslim League, before they are finally recommended by you to the Crown for appointment. The Working Committee feels very strongly on this point and regards it as one of the fundamental principles.

(3) Besides the foreging, certain other points were also discussed in the Working Committee particularly the question of providing an effective safeguard against unfair decisions of the majority. While the Committee appreciated the remarks in the statement of the Secretary of State in the House of Commons that the power of veto will be exercised by the Viceroy to protect the minority interests, it was felt that some other effective safeguard would be necessary in the interest of smooth working of the interim arrangement. It was, however, thought that this question could be settled after the strength and the composition of the Executive Council was decided upon.

I have given in the above paragraphs the unanimous opinion of my Working Committee and

I am ready and willing, if you so desire, to meet you and explain the reasons and the grounds for the decision arrived at by the Working Committee.

Letter from Sir Evan Jenkins to Mr. Jinnah dated July 9th, 1945.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

His Excellency asks me to thank you for your letter of 7th July, and to say that he will be glad to see you at 4 p.m. this afternoon, or later this afternoon if that is more convenient to you. Perhaps you would be kind enough to ask your Secretary to ring me up and confirm the time.

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Jinnah dated 9th July, 1945.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

At the end of our talk yesterday evening you said that I could make your problem easier if I replied in writing to your letter of 7th July. I do not think you expect any comment now on the first and third points in that letter. Our talk was concerned mainly with the second point, that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive Council should be chosen from the Muslim League before they are finally recommended to the Crown for appointment.

(2) I fully appreciate your difficulties, but regret that I am unable to give you the guarantee

you wish, i.e., that all the Muslim members of the proposed New Council shall necessarily be members of the muslim League. As I explained to you, I cannot commit myself to give a similar guarantee to any other party.

I have to attempt to form an Executive Council representative, competent, and generally acceptable. But of course I cannot compel any person or any party to co-operate in my own solution if they do not wish to do so.

It will help me greatly if you will let me have names from the Muslim League and I sincerely hope you will do so. I asked for eight, but will certainly accept five if you do not wish to send more. You can consider later whether any solution I put forward is acceptable to you.

(3) During the next two or three years, decisions of great importance will have to be taken by the Government of India, whatever its composition may be. These decisions—on demobilisation, economic development, taxation, trade and so on—cannot wait, and it is the hope of His Majesty's Government that the Executive Council responsible for them will be one in which the major political parties are represented. It will be of course my principle duty to see fairplay between all parties not only in the composition of the proposed Council but in its working.

(4) I need the active help of your colleagues and yourself, and I am sure you will give it to me.

I have no objection to your showing this letter to your colleagues, but it is not intended for publication.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Lord Wavell dated 9th July, 1945.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I thank you for your letter of the 9th July, which I placed before my Working Committee. The Committee after giving its very careful consideration to the matter, desires me to state that it regrets very much to note that Your Excellency is not able to give the assurance that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive Council will be selected from the Muslim League. In my letter of the 7th July, I mentioned that the Committee considers this as one of the fundamental principles, and in the circumstances, I regret, I am not in a position to send the names on behalf of the Muslim League for inclusion in the proposed Executive Council desired by you.

I should like to assure your Excellency that it has been the earnest desire of the Committee and myself to help in every reasonable way, but it is not possible for us to depart from our fundamental principles. I need not therefore, at present say anything more with regard to the other points raised.

Letter from the Secretary to the Governor-General to Mr. Jinnah dated July 10th. 1945.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

His Excellency asks me to thank you for your letter of 9th July. He will have to take two or three days to consider the position and will write to you when he has decided what to do.

* * *

WAVELL — JINNAH

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah.

Dated: June 4, 1946.

(Personal and confidential)

You asked me yesterday to give you an assurance about the action that would be taken if one party accepted the scheme in the Cabinet Delegation's statement of May 16, and the other refused.

I can give you on behalf of the Cabinet Delegation my personal assurance that we do not propose to make any discrimination in the treatment of either party and that we shall go ahead with the plan laid down in the statement so far as circumstances permit if either party accepts, but we hope that both will accept.

I should be grateful if you would see that the existence of this assurance does not become public. If it is necessary for you to tell Working Committee that you have an assurance, I should be grateful if you would explain to them this condition.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, Dated June 8, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

During the course of our discussions regarding the interim government at Simla and thereafter at Delhi on the 3rd June, after my arrival, and before the meeting of the Muslim League Working Committee took place, you were good enough to give me the assurance that there will be only 12 portfolios, five on behalf of the League, five Congress, one Sikh and one Christian or Anglo-Indian, and that as regards the portfolios, the most important portfolios will be equally divided between the League and the Congress in the distribution thereof, further details being left open for discussion.

With your previous permission I informed the Working Committee of this assurance and this was one of the most important considerations which weighed with them together with the statement of the Cabinet Mission. These two together formed one whole and, as such, the Council of the All-India Muslim League has given its final decision on

June 6. I may further inform you that similarly I had to repeat the assurance to the Council before they finally gave their approval. As you know, the meeting of the All-India League Council was held in camera and there, again, the House showed great opposition to the scheme in the beginning.

During the course of discussions at a very early stage, a large body of opposition was satisfied when I made the statement in answer to the very pressing question as to what our position will be with regard to the interim government. But for this assurance, we could not have got the approval of the Council to the scheme. As requested by you, I took as much care as possible to see that it did not become public.

I am writing this letter to you as I find that a very sinister agitation has been set on foot by the Congress press against your formula stated above, which was the turning point in our having secured the decision of the Council. Any departure from this formula, directly or indirectly, will lead to very serious consequences and will not secure the co-operation of the Muslim League.

You know further that the Congress may adopt an offensive attitude by including a Muslim in their quota, which will be strongly resented by the Muslim League and which will be another very great hurdle before us.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. M.A. Jinnah, dated June, 9, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of yesterday. You speak of an assurance about the 5: 5: 2 ratio. There was no assurance on this point, but I told you, as I told the Congress, that this was what I had in mind. It would be wrong for me to leave you under the impression that there was any assurance, although I hope that we may reach agreement on that basis.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. M. A. Jinnah Dated June 12, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I am anxious to have an opportunity of consulting you together with Mr. Nehru as to how best I can fill the various posts in the interim government. Could you come to see me for this purpose at 5 p.m. today?

It is not my intention to discuss any question of principle such as "parity" or otherwise, but to concentrate upon what I know to be our common objective, that is, to get the best possible interim government drawn from the two major parties and some of the minorities and to approach this decision by a consideration of what the portfolios should be and how each one can best be filled.

I am sending a similar letter to Mr. Nehru.

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated June 12, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of June 12.

I have already informed you by my letter dated June 8, that our decision accepting the scheme in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation was based on your formula of parity as one of the most important considerations which weighed with the Working Committee and the Council of the Muslim League in finally arriving at their decision.

I understand that the Congress have not yet given their decision. It seems to me that until they decide it is not advisable to discuss how best either personnel or portfolios should be adjusted. I agree with you that important portfolios should be equally distributed between the two major parties and we should get the best possible men for these portfolios.

But I am of the opinion that no use or purpose would be served until the Congress have given their decision with regard to the scheme embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Mission of May 16.

If you wish to discuss anything further I shall be glad to see you alone.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah, Dated June 15, 1946.

I am writing to inform you that after discussions with the Congress representatives I have failed to negotiate an agreement on the basis which I suggested to you. The Cabinet Mission and myself have therefore, decided to issue tomorrow a statement on the action we propose to take and we will let you have a copy of this before publication.

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, Dated June 18, 1946.

In the course of my interview with you this evening you informed me that the Congress proposed to substitute Dr. Zahir Hussain for one of the Caste Hindus invited by you to join an interim government although you expressed the hope that they would not do so.

I told you that the reaction of Muslim India would be deadly against such a substitution and the Muslim League would never accept the nomination of any Muslim by you other than a Muslim Leaguer.

I placed the matter before my Working Committee and it has unanimously endorsed this view and considers it vital and fundamental.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated June 19, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th June, 1946, together with an advance copy of the statement by the Cabinet Delegation and yourself of the same date.

In my interview with you at Simla prior to the announcement of the Cabinet Delegation's proposals, you had informed me that you were going to form the interim government consisting of 12 members on the basis of five Muslim League, five Congress, one Sikh and one Indian Christian or Anglo-Indian. As regards the portfolios, you had indicated that the important ones would be equally divided between the Muslim League and the Congress but details of actual allotment were to be left open for discussion. After the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and yourself, dated the 16th of May, 1946, you again, on the 3rd of June, at New Delhi, gave me to understand that the formula for the formation of the interim government disclosed to me at Simla would be followed. On both the occasions I sought your permission to communicate this information to my Working Committee which you kindly gave. Accordingly I gave a full account of the talks I had with you and the decision of the Working Committee in regard to the acceptance of the long-term proposals was largely influenced by the faith which they reposed in the scheme for the formation of the interim

government disclosed by you to me on the two occasions. Further, as I have already pointed out in my letter to you of 8th June, 1946, I made the statement before the Council of the All-India Muslim League that was the formula, which, I was assured by you, would be the basis on which you would proceed to form your interim government, and, therefore, this formed an integral part of the plan embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation. This was one of the most important considerations which weighed with the Council of the All-India Muslim League also in arriving at their decision, although even then there was a section that was opposed to the plan being accepted.

When the Congress press started the sinister agitation against Congress—League parity, with a view to informing you of the Muslim League stand, I wrote to you on the 8th June, that "any departure from this formula, directly or indirectly, will lead to serious consequences and will not secure the co-operation of the Muslim League."

Subsequently, in my interview with you on the 13th June, you informed me that you wanted to alter the basis and proceed on the formula of five Muslim League, and three others, namely, one Sikh, one Scheduled Caste, and one Indian Christian. I told you then that if any change was proposed to be made I would have to place the matter before the Working Committee and may have to call another meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League. I also informed you that when the Congress finally agreed to your new

formula I would then place it before my Working Committee to take such action as they deemed necessary.

After discussion with the Congress representatives you wrote to me on the 15th June, informing me that you had failed to negotiate an agreement on the composition of the interim government on the basis of 5: 5: 3 and that the Cabinet Delegation and yourself would issue a statement on the 16th of June, on the action that you proposed to take and that you would let me have a copy of it before publication.

Accordingly you sent me a copy of the statement by the Cabinet Delegation and yourself issued on the 16th June, with a covering letter of the same date, which I placed before my Working Committee, who after careful consideration of the matter have authorised me to state as follows:

(a) That the Working Committee are surprised that invitations have been issued to five Muslim Leaguers to join the interim government without calling for a list from the leader of the Muslim League.

(b) That your latest proposal on the basis of which you now desire to form your interim government shows that you have abandoned parity between the Congress and the Muslim League, the two major parties, and have substituted parity between the Muslim League and Caste Hindus, and have added a fourth representative of the minorities

namely, a Parsee. One of the minority representatives nominated by you, i.e. Mr. Jagjivan Ram, is a Congressman and has been selected, it appears, not to give real representation to the Scheduled Castes, but to give an additional seat to the Congress in the interim government;

(c) That the modifications which have been made in the original formula for the interim government have adversely affected the proportion of the Muslims in the interim government as a whole and as against the Congress as a single group;

(d) That in view of the serious changes which have, from time to time been made to satisfy the Congress, it is not possible for the Working Committee to arrive at any decision in the matter of the formation of the interim government so long as the Congress does not finally convey its decision on the proposals to you; and

(e) That the question of distribution of portfolios should also be finally decided so that there may be no further hitch created by the Congress in this regard and the Working Committee may have a complete picture before them when they meet to consider the proposals.

Further, I shall be grateful if you will please make the following points clear with reference to your letter and statement of the 16th June:

1. Whether the proposals contained in the statement for the setting up of an interim govern-

ment are now final or whether they are still open to any further change or modification at the instance of any of the parties or persons concerned;

2. Whether the total number of 14 members of the government as proposed in the statement would remain unchanged during the interim period;

3. If any person or persons invited as representatives of the four minorities, viz., the Scheduled Castes, the Sikhs, the Indian Christains and the Parsees, is, or are, unable to accept the invitation to join the interim government for personal or other reasons how will the vacancy or vacancies thus created be filled by the Viceroy; and whether in filling up the vacancy or vacancies the leader of the Muslim League will be consulted and his consent obtained;

4. (a) Whether during the interim period for which the coalition government is being set up the proportion of members of the government, community-wise, as provided in the proposals, will be maintained;

(b) Whether the present representation given to four minorities, viz., the Scheduled Castes, the Sikhs, the Indian Christains and the Parsees will be adhered to without any change or modification; and

5. In view of the substitution of 14 now proposed for the original of 12, and the change made in the original formula, whether there will be

a provision, in order to safeguard Muslim interests, that the Executive Council shall not take any decision on any major communal issue if the majority of the Muslim members are opposed to it.

I trust that you will kindly favour me with your reply as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Jinnah, dated June 20, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I thank you for your letter of the 19th June, which I have shown to the Cabinet Mission.

I do not think it is necessary for me to comment on the first part of your letter. I am sure you will appreciate that negotiations designed to secure acceptance by two parties with conflicting interests may not always end on the same basis as that on which they began; and, as you know, I never gave you any guarantee that they would necessarily be concluded on any particular basis.

I note the views of the Muslim League set out in paragraphs (a) to (e) of your letter.

The intention in the statement of June 16, was that the discussion of portfolios with leaders of the two main parties should follow the acceptance by both parties of the scheme. This intention still holds, since until the names are known, it is difficult to decide on the distribution of portfolios.

On the points which you desire to be made clear in connection with the government to be formed under our statement of June 16, I gave you the following reply after consultation with the delegation:

(1) Until I have received acceptance from those invited to take office in the interim government, the names in the statement cannot be regarded as final. But no change in principle will be made in the statement without the consent of the two major parties.

(2) No change in the number of 14 members of the interim government will be made without the agreement of the two major parties.

(3) If any vacancy occurs among the seats at present allotted to representatives of minorities, I shall naturally consult both the main parties before filling it.

(4) (a) and (b). The proportion of members community-wise will not be changed with-

out the agreement of the two major parties.

(5) No decision on a major communal issue could be taken by the interim government if the majority of either of the main parties were opposed to it. I pointed this out to the Congress President and he agreed that the Congress appreciated this point.

If you agree, I will send copies of the questions in your letter and of paragraphs 4 and 5 of this letter to the President of the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated June 21, 1946.

I thank you for your letter of June 20, (No. 45).

With regard to paragraph 2, of your letter, I regret I am unable to agree with the view that you take.

As regards your request whether you should send copies of the questions 4 (a) and 4 (b) in my letter and paragraphs 4 and 5 of your letter under reply to the President of the Congress, I have no objection if you think it proper to do so.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah dated June 25, 1946.

You asked for a letter in confirmation of what the Mission said to you this evening. We informed you that the Congress had accepted the statement of May 16, while refusing to take part in the interim government proposed in the statement of June 16. This has produced situation in which paragraph 8 of the statement of June 16, takes effect.

This paragraph said that if either of the two major parties was unwilling to join in the setting up of a coalition government on the lines laid down in the statement, the Viceroy would proceed with the formation of an interim government which will be as representative as possible of those willing to accept the statement of May 16.

Since the Congress and the Muslim League have now both accepted the statement of May 16, it is the intention to form a coalition government including both those parties as soon as possible. In view, however, of the long negotiations which have already taken place and since we all have other work to do, we feel that it will be better to have a short interval before proceeding with further negotiations for the formation of an interim government.

This, therefore, is the course of action we propose to adopt unless the two main parties can within the next few days agree upon a basis on which they can co-operate in a coalition government.

Meanwhile the election and summoning of a Constituent Assembly as laid down in the statement of May 16, are going forward.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated June 26, 1946.

I received your letter dated June 25, at midnight last night after I had sent you the resolution of my Working Committee passed at its meeting yesterday with a covering letter of the same date agreeing to join the interim government on the basis of the statement of the Cabinet Mission and youself dated June 16, and the clarifications and assurances given by you after consultation with the Cabinet Mission in your letter dated June 20 addressed to me.

I regret that the Congress while accepting the statement of May 16, should have rejected the proposals regarding the setting up of the interim government on the basis of the statement of June 16, which was the final decision of the Cabinet Mission and yourself in this regard.

May I draw your attention to paragraph 8 of the statement of June 16, which clearly lays down that the acceptance of the statement of May 16, and rejection of the final proposals embodied in the statement of June 16, cannot change the basis and principles laid down therein.

In paragraph 3 of your letter, when you say that the Viceroy would proceed with the formation

of an interim government 'which will be as representative as possible, of those willing to accept the statement of May 16', the quotation qualifies them to be included in the interim government, but only on the basis of and the principles laid down in your proposals of June 16.

In these circumstances, as indicated in the statement of June 16, paragraph 7, that you aimed at inaugurating the interim government about June 26, I hope you will not now delay the matter but go ahead with the formation of the interim government on the basis of your statement of June 16.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah, Dated June 27, 1946.

"Thank you for your letter of yesterday, I am sorry that my letter did not reach you till after the meeting of your Working Committee had ended".

"As we explained to you during our interview on Tuesday, the Cabinet Mission and I consider that in the light of paragraph 8 of the statement of June 16, I am clearly bound to make an attempt to form a government representative of both the major parties, since both have accepted the statement of May 16".

"I think you will agree that it is essential to have a short interval before resuming negotiations; and, as we informed you, it is proposed to set up a temporary 'caretaker' government of officials. I

intend reopening negotiations after elections are completed. Meanwhile the Cabinet Mission will return home to report".

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated June 28, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of June 27. I had already pointed out by my letter of June 26, in reply to yours of June 25, and also at the interview on Tuesday, June 25, with you and the Cabinet Mission that you were in honour bound to proceed forthwith with the formation of your interim government in accordance with the statement of June 16, which was final, and the assurances given to us.

The Cabinet Mission and yourself issued an official statement late in the evening of June 26, and, as I have already pointed out in my statement issued to the press yesterday, by that pronouncement you have chosen to go back upon your pledged word by postponing the formation of the interim government.

Now I have received your letter of June 27, and hereby inform you that I cannot agree with you when you say in your letter that "it is essential to have a short interval before resuming negotiations". I repeat that you should have proceeded in terms of paragraph 8 of the statement of June 16, without delay. But since you have adopted this course of action in the official statement of the Cabinet Mission

and yourself, which is neither fair nor just, I strongly urge upon you without prejudice that the elections to the Constituent Assembly should also be postponed as you know that according to all the relevant documents and particularly the two statements of the Cabinet Mission and yourself dated May 16 and 25, the long-term plan and the formation of the interim government formed one whole, each constituting an integral part of the whole scheme. It is, therefore, undersirable to proceed with one part, i.e., elections to the Constituent Assembly, and to postpone the other.

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Jinnah, dated June 28, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The Cabinet Mission and I feel that there are certain points in your statement released yesterday which it would be wrong to leave unanswered.

You will remember that at an interview which the Cabinet Mission and I had with you on the evening of the 25th June, before the meeting of your Working Committee at which you accepted the proposals in the statement of the 16th June, explained to you that as the Congress had accepted the statement of the 16th May, while refusing to take part in the interim government proposed in the statement of the 16th June, this had produced a situation in which paragraph 8 of the statement of the 16th June, took effect. This paragraph

stated that if either of the two major parties was unwilling to join in the setting up of a coalition government on the lines laid down in that statement, the Viceroy would proceed with the formation of an interim government which would be as representative as possible of those willing to accept the statement of the 16th May.

We said that since the Congress and the Muslim League had now both accepted the statement of the 16th May, it was the intention to form a coalition government including both those parties as soon as possible. In view, however, of the long negotiations which had already taken place, and since we all had other work to do, we felt that it would be better to have a short interval before proceeding with further negotiations for the formation of an interim government. Thus whatever interpretation you may put on paragraph 8, your Working Committee can have been in no doubt as to the course we proposed to adopt.

I confirmed in writing the same evening what we had told you.

Secondly, the assurances which you quote in your statement related specifically to the particular interim government that would have been set up if both major parties had accepted the statement of the 16th June.

To prevent misunderstanding I propose to publish this letter together with your letter of the

19th June, the substance of which has already appeared in the press, and my reply of the 20th June.

Yours sincerely,

Wavell.

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Jinnah, dated June 28, 1946.

I have received your letter of the 28th June, and have shown it to the Cabinet Ministers.

We are quite unable to accept your suggestion that we have gone back on our word. As I have said in a letter to you earlier today our course of action was determined by what had been laid down in paragraph 8 of the statement of the 16th June, and we had made it plain to you before your Working Committee meeting on the 25th June, that we proposed to follow this course.

The arrangements for the elections to the Constituent Assembly have already been put into operation and we do not propose to postpone them.

As the substance of your letter was included in the All-India Radio news today I am publishing this reply.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to the Viceroy, in reply

to his two letters of June 28, released to the Press on June 29, 1946.

I am in receipt of your letter of June 28. The facts are correctly stated in my statement that was released to the Press yesterday, June 27. The explanation that you now give in your letter under reply of what took place between me and the Cabinet Mission and yourself does not change in any way the position.

The fact is that you did not communicate to me your views officially before the meeting of the Working Committee. I requested you to give your views officially to me and you did so by your letter of June 25, which reached me at midnight after the Working Committee had passed their resolution which was released to the press according to the solemn arrangement that we were to give our reply immediately after the decision of the Congress. If you wish to take the credit that some indication was given to me of the change on your part in the course of the interview, where we discussed so many things, you may do so.

As regards paragraph 2 of your letter I am surprised when you say that the assurances quoted by me from your letter in my statement were given if both the major parties had accepted the statement of June 16. No such indication of any condition is given in your letter of June 20, which I understand from your Private Secretary has already been released to the press together with some other

correspondence. May I request you to release this letter also.

I have received a second letter from you dated June 28. May I also request you to publish the full text of my letter of June 28, asking you to postpone the Constituent Assembly elections and not only a substance of it which might have appeared in the All-India Radio broadcast-as you propose to release your reply to the press.

Jinnah.

Letter from the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah, dated June 29, 1946.

Thank you for your letter of yesterday.

In regard to your paragraph 3, I refer to the opening sentence of paragraph 5 of my letter of June 20, which reads as follows: "On the points which you desire to make clear in connection with the government to be formed under our statement of June 18, I give you the following reply after consultation with the Cabinet Mission."

I have underlined the relevant words. It was clear from this sentence that the assurances given applied only to the particular interim government proposed in the statement of June 16.

I have no objection to your publishing your letter of June 28, suggesting postponement of elections to the Constituent Assembly of your letter under reply.

Statement of Mr. Jinnah.

Complaining that not all the letters that passed between him and the Viceroy, were published, Mr. Jinnah released the other letters and stated as follows:

The Cabinet Delegation and His Excellency the Viceroy have thought fit to release only a few letters torn from the rest of the correspondence that passed between me and the delegation and the Viceroy, which have a very important bearing on the present controversy: that the Viceroy did make a clear representation to me that he would proceed to form his interim government on the basis of the formula 5: 5: 2, i.e. five representatives of the Muslim League, five of the Congress one Sikh and one Indian Christian or Anglo-Indian, and that as regards the portfolios, the most important portfolios will be equally divided between the League and the Congress in distribution thereof, further details being left open for discussion.

The Viceroy further authorised me to make that representation to my Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League, which I did, and, it was on that basis that both the Working Committee and the Council were induced to accept the long-term plan and the proposal for the interim government together as a whole.

This formula had a vital bearing and did greatly weigh with the Council of the All-India Muslim League in coming to their final decision,

which was communicated to the Viceroy on June 7. Immediately thereafter, sinister agitation was set on foot by the Congress press against this formula, and I informed the Viceroy by my letter of June 8, by way of caution, that there should be no departure from this formula. Below is the full-text of this letter which speaks for itself.

* * *

IV

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr. Jinnah, dated 22nd July, 1946.

(Personal and Confidential).

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I declare my intention of replacing the present caretaker government of officials by an interim coalition government as soon as possible; and am now putting to you as President of the Muslim League and to the President of the Congress the proposals set out below.

2. I think you will probably agree with me that our negotiations both this summer and last year were hampered by the attendant publicity, I am, therefore, seeking your co-operation in conducting at any rate the preliminary stages of the negotiations on a strictly personal and secret basis between myself and the two Presidents. I very

much hope that you will prevent this correspondence being known to or discussed in the press until we have seen whether we can find some basis of agreement. I realise, of course, that you will have at some stage to secure the approval of your Working Committee; but I believe it will be best to try and reach some basis of agreement between ourselves as first step. I propose the following for your consideration:

(a) The interim government will consist of 14 members.

(b) Six members (to include one Scheduled Caste representative) will be nominated by the Congress: Five members will be nominated by the Muslim League. Three representatives of minorities will be nominated by the Viceroy. One of these places will be kept for a Sikh. It will not be open to either Congress or the Muslim League to object to the names submitted by the other party, provided they are accepted by the Viceroy.

(c) Distribution of portfolios will be decided after the parties have agreed to enter the government and have submitted their names. The Congress and the Muslim League will each have an equitable share of the most important portfolios.

(d) The assurance about the status of the interim government which I gave in my

letter dated 30th May, to Maulana Azad will stand.

3. I would welcome a convention, if freely offered by the Congress, that major communal issues can only be decided by the assent of both the major parties. But I have never thought that it was essential to make this a formal condition since in fact a coalition government could work on no other basis.

4. I sincerely trust that your party will agree to co-operate in the administration of India on the above basis, while the work of constitution making proceeds. I am confident that this will be of the the greatest possible benefit to India. I suggest that we should not spend further time in negotiation; but should try out at once a government on the basis proposed above. If it does not work, and you find the conditions unsatisfactory, it will be open to you to withdraw, but I am confident that you will not.

5. Would you be good enough to let me know very soon whether the Muslim League will enter in the interim government on this basis? I have written in similar terms to Pandit Nehru and enclose a copy of my letter to him.

Yours sincerely,

Wavell.

P.S. I am seeing Pandit Nehru this afternoon on other matters and will hand him his letter then.

Mr. Jinnah's reply to the above dated 31st July 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I am in receipt of your letter of 22nd July, and I notice that this is the fourth basis that you are suggesting for the formation of your interim government. From 5: 5: 2 you came to 5: 5: 3 and then 5: 5: 4 as embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and yourself dated the 16th June, 1946, which was announced by you as final. Now you are making this fourth proposal i.e., 6: 5: 3.

Every time the Congress turned down the previous three proposals as you were unable to appease them or propitiate them; and every time the departure was prejudicial to the League and in favour of the Congress.

And now you have put your fourth proposal for my consideration.

It gives a go by to all the important terms which were in favour of the Muslim League; the Congress, will have six members out of 14 as against 5 members of the Muslim League which breaks straightaway the principle of parity; and you are letting down the Scheduled Castes as one of them is proposed to be nominated by the Congress and

not by the real spokesmen of the Scheduled Castes. I note that you say that five members will be nominated by the Muslim League. Next, three members by the minorities be nominated by the Viceroy without reference to or consultation with the Muslim League. The only indication that you have given is that one of these places will be kept for a Sikh.

Then you proceed on to say that 'it will not be open either to the Congress or the Muslim League to object to names submitted by other party, provided they are accepted by the Viceroy, and from this I gather that it will be open to the Congress to nominate a quisling Muslim.

As to the distribution of portfolios, I note you say that "the Congress and the Muslim League will have an equitable share of the most important portfolios", and not equal as it was orginally proposed.

As to the assurance about safeguards i.e., that major communal issue could only be decided by the consent of both the major parties, you say that 'it will be only considered if freely offered by the Congress', but you do not attach much importance to it and you conclude by saying that if the interim government does not work when formed on this basis and if we find conditions unsatisfactory, it will be open to us to withdraw. I believe in the principle 'prevention is better than cure'.

This is a very clear and substantial departure,

most detrimental to the Muslim League, and is obviously intended to appease the Congress and devised primarily to meet their wishes.

Taking the final proposal of June 16, 1946, in your letter dated the 20th of June, you informed me that 14 members were invited by you on the basis of parity between Hindus and Muslims and community-wise and that it will not be changed without the agreement of two major parties. Apart from the secret talks you had with the Congress you clearly conveyed to us that the invitees were asked to join specifically on the basis of 5 Hindus, 5 Muslims, one Sikh, one Scheduled Caste, one Christian and, one Parsee. Your present proposal clearly destroys the principles of parity as well as representation according to communities and gives a clear majority to the Congress as against the Muslim League to start with.

Further the Scheduled Caste will be nominated by the Congress, which in my opinion is most unjust to a community of 60 million people, who are groaning under the social and economic tyranny of the high Caste Hindus, whom alone the Congress really represents.

As regards representatives of other minorities, they will be nominated by you without reference to or any consultation with the Muslim League. This again is a departure from what you stated in your letter of the 20th June, that 'if any vacancy occurs among the seats at present allotted to the representatives of the minorities, I shall naturally consult

both the major parties before filling it.' I think you will appreciate that when you start with 6 Congress and 5 Muslim League with a Congress majority, the minority representatives will hold a very strong position as a balancing element, who would be nominated by you without having even consultation with the Muslim League and this is a serious departure from what we were assured of in your letter of the 20th of June.

You categorically state in your letter of 20th June, paragraph 5, that no 'decision on a major communal issue would be taken by the interim government if a majority of the representatives of either of the two major parties were opposed to it', whereas now in the present proposals you inform me that you will welcome a convention if freely offered by the Congress.

As you have written this letter to me and is strictly personal and secret I can only say that in my opinion there is no chance of my Working Committee accepting this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Jinnah.

Letter from the Viceroy, dated 8th August, 1946.
(Personal and Secret).

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have received your letter of the 31st July,

about my proposal for an interim government.

2. I am sorry that things have gone the way they have, but I do not think it would be profitable now to enter into a detailed discussion of the points you raise in your letter. I will only remind you that the basis of representation which I suggested in the letter to which you now reply is the same as the one the Muslim League Working Committee accepted at the end of June, namely, 6: 5: 3.

3. In view of the League resolutions of the 29th July, I have now decided to invite the Congress to make proposals for an interim government, and I am sure that if they make a reasonable offer to you of a coalition, I can rely on you for a ready response. I have told the President of the Congress that any interim government would be on the basis of the assurances given in my letter of the 30th May to Maulana Azad.

I hope we may have an opportunity of meeting soon.

Yours sincerely,

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to H. E. The Viceroy, dated October 3, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

At the end of our last interview on October 2,

1946, it was agreed that I should finally put before you the various proposals that emerged out of our discussions, for your consideration and reply. Accordingly, I am enclosing herewith the various proposals that have been formulated by me.

M. A. Jinnah.

ENCLOSURE:

1. The total number of the members of the Executive Council to be 14.

2. Six nominees of the Congress will include one Scheduled Caste representative, but it must not be taken that the Muslim League has agreed to, or approves of, the selection of the Scheduled Caste representative, the ultimate responsibility in that behalf being with the Governor-General and the Viceroy.

3. That the Congress should not include in the remaining five members of their quota a Muslim of their choice.

4. Safeguard.—That there should be a convention that on major communal issues, if the majority of Hindu or Muslim members of the Executive Council are opposed, then no decision should be taken.

5. An alternative or rotational Vice-President should be appointed in fairness to both major

communities, as was adopted in the U.N.O. Conference.

6. The Muslim League was not consulted in the selection of the three minority representatives, i.e., Sikh, Indian Christian and Parsi, and it should not be taken that the Muslim League approves of the selection that has been made. But in future, in the event of there being a vacancy owing to death, resignation or otherwise, representatives of these minorities should be chosen in consultation with the two major parties-the Muslim League and the Congress.

7. Portfolios.—The most important portfolios should be equally distributed between the two major parties-the Muslim League and the Congress.

8. That the above arrangement should not be changed or modified unless both the major parties-the Muslim League and the Congress-agree.

9. The question of the settlement of the long-term plan should stand over until a better and more conducive atmosphere is created and an agreement has been reached on the points stated above and after the interim government has been reformed and finally set up.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah dated October 4, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter dated yesterday.

Replies to your nine points are as follows :—

1. This is agreed.

2. I note that what you say and accept that the responsibility is mine.

3. I am unable to agree to this. Each party must be equally free to nominate its own representatives.

4. In a coalition government it is impossible to decide major matters of policy when one of the main parties to the coalition is strongly against a course of action proposed. My present colleagues and I are agreed that it would be fatal to allow major communal issues to be decided by vote in the Cabinet. The efficiency and prestige of the interim government will depend on ensuring that differences are resolved in advance of Cabinet meetings by friendly discussions. A coalition government either works by a process of mutual adjustments or does not work at all.

5. The arrangement of alternative or rotational Vice-President would present practical difficulty, and I do not consider it feasible. I will, however, arrange to nominate a Muslim League member to preside over the Cabinet in the event of the Governor-General and the Vice-President being absent. I will also nominate a Muslim League member as Vice-Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee of the Cabinet, which is most important. I am Chairman of this Committee and in the past have presided almost invariably, but I shall probably do so only on special occasions in future.

6. I accept that both major parties would be consulted before filling a vacancy in any of these three seats.

7. In present conditions all the portfolios in the Cabinet are of great importance and it is a matter of opinion which are the most important. The minority representatives cannot be excluded from a share of the major portfolios and it would also be suitable to continue Mr. Jagjivan Ram in the Labour Portfolio. But, subject to this, there can be equal distribution of the most important portfolios between the Congress and the Muslim League. Details would be a matter for negotiation.

8. I agree.

9. Since the basis for participation in the Cabinet is of course acceptance of the statement of May 16. I assume that the League Council will meet at a very early date to reconsider its Bombay resolution.

Wavell.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah, dated Oct. 12, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I confirm what I told you this evening, that the Muslim League are at liberty to nominate anyone they wish for their own quota of seats in the Cabinet though any person proposed must of course be accepted by me and by His Majesty before being appointed.

My intention is to discuss portfolios when all the names have been received, both from the Muslim League and the Congress.

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy dated Oct. 13, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have considered the whole matter fully and I am now authorised to state that they do not approve of the basis and scheme of setting up the interim government which has been decided by you, presumably with the authority of His Majesty's Government.

Therefore, the Committee do not, and cannot, agree with your decision already taken, nor with the arrangements you have already made.

We consider and maintain that the imposition of this decision is contrary to the declaration of August 8, 1940, but since, according to your decision, we have a right to nominate five members of the Executive Council on behalf of the Muslim League, my Committee have for various reasons come to the conclusion that in the interests of Mussalmans and other communities it will be fatal to leave the entire field of administration of the Central Government in the hands of the Congress. Besides, you may be forced to have in your interim government Muslims who would not command the respect and confidence of Muslim India, which would lead to very serious consequences: and,

lastly, for other very weighty grounds and reasons, which are obvious and need not be mentioned, we have decided to nominate five on behalf of the Muslim League in terms of your broadcast dated August 24, 1946, and your two letters to me dated October 4 and 12, embodying clarifications and assurances.

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr. M.A. Jinnah, dated October 13, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of today's date. I am glad to know that the Muslim League has decided to join the interim government. Will you please let me have the names of the five representatives, as they are to be submitted to His Majesty for approval, and I should like to reform the Government as soon as possible.

You promised yesterday that you would let me have the names today.

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy, dated October 14, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I thank you for your letter of October 13. I am now sending you the names of five nominees on behalf of the Muslim League, as arranged in our interview of yesterday.

1. Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Honorary Secretary, All-India Muslim League, M.L.A. (Central).

2. Mr. I. I. Chundrigar, M.L.A. (Bombay), leader, Muslim League Party in the Bombay Legislative Assembly and President of the Bombay Provincial Muslim League.

3. Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar, Advocate (N.W.F.P.) member of the Working Committee, All-India Muslim League, Committee of Action and Council.

4. Mr. Ghazanfar Ali Khan, M.L.A. (Punjab), member of the Council, All-India Muslim League; Members of the Council, Provincial Muslim League, and member of the Punjab Muslim League Working Committee.

5. Mr. Jogendra Nath Mandal, Advocate (Bengal), at present Minister of the Bengal Government.

M. A. Jinnah.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr. Jinnah, dated October 25, 1946.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

The portfolios that I can offer the Muslim League in the interim government are the following: Finance, Commerce, Posts and Air, Health and Legislative.

I should be grateful if you would let me know how you would propose that these portfolios

should be distributed among the Muslim League representatives in the Cabinet.

I should like to get an announcement out tonight and to swear in the new members, whom I shall warmly welcome, tomorrow.

Wavell.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy, Dated October 25, 1946.

Dear Lord Wavell,

I am in receipt of your letter of October 25, at 5-30 p.m. communicating your decision regarding portfolios.

I am sorry I cannot say that it is an equitable distribution, but we have discussed all the pros and cons and, as you have taken your final decision, I need not go into the matter further.

I am sending you below the names of the nominees of the Muslim League, showing how these portfolios should be distributed amongst them.

Finance, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan.
Commerce, Mr. I. I. Chundrigar.
Post and Air, Mr. A.R. Nishtar.
Health, Mr. Ghazanfar Ali Khan.
Legislative, Mr. Jogendar Nath Mandal.

M. A. Jinnah.

Last letter—

No. 475—G.G(c).

Governor-General's House,
Karachi.

Camp, Quetta.

1st September, 1948.

Dear Sir Douglas,

Thank you for your letter No. 0008/1/C in C, dated the 26th August 1948.

I have passed on a copy of your letter to the Vice-President, Quaid-i-Azam's Relief Fund and I have given my approval to the grant of Rs. 3 lakhs from Quaid-i-Azam's Relief Fund to enable you to defray the initial expenses for the resettlement of soldier refugees in the Thal Project.

Your sincerely,

(M. A. Jinnah).

General Sir Douglas Gracey,
KCIE, CB, CBE, MC,
Commander-in-Chief, Pakistan Army,
Rawalpindi.

Some of The Important Letters From the First Edition

LORD LINLITHGOW

Form M. A. Jinnah Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League.

New Delhi, November 5th, 1939

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I wish to thank you for giving me the interview on the 4th of November as you had promised in your letter of the 28th of October wherein you stated that you will be glad at some suitable moment to endeavour further to elucidate any points that there may be in doubt as desired by the resolution of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League of the 22nd of October.

In my interview with you on the 4th of November the subject was fully discussed and now, as desired by Your Excellency, I am herewith submitting to you the following points for your consideration and early reply :—

(1) that as soon as circumstances may permit or immediately after the war the entire problem of India's future constitution, apart from the Government of India Act, 1935, shall be examined and reconsidered *de novo;*

(2) that no declaration shall, either in principle or otherwise, be made or any constitution be enacted by His Majesty's Government or the Parliament without the approval and the consent of the two major communities of India, viz., the Mussalmans and the Hindus;

(3) that His Majesty's Government should try and meet all reasonable national demands of the Arabs in Palestine;

(4) that the Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim power or country.

I have already, in my interview, fully explained the reasons and the grounds in support of these points over and above of what is indicated in the statement of the 18th of September and the resolution of the 22nd of October of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, copies of which have already been sent to Your Excellency.

There is one more point which was mentioned in the statement of the Working Committee of the 18th of September, viz., the question of securing justice and fairplay to the Mussalmans in the Congress-governed Provinces where even their elementary rights were being ruthlessly trampled upon; but as the Congress Ministries have gone out of office I do not desire to say anything regarding this matter at present.

May I inform Your Excellency that I am leaving for Bombay tomorrow morning.

Yours sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah

The Viceroy's House, New Delhi,
November 7th, 1939

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Many thanks for your letter of 5th November. I fully appreciate the importance of the points which you raise and I will not fail to let you have as early a reply as practicable.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

Bombay, November 18th, 1939

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

Thank you for your letter of the 7th November 1939. Since the receipt of your letter I have been pressed with inquiries from different parts of the country as to how and where we stand. Would you, therefore, mind if I were to publish my letter to Your Excellency, dated the 5th November and your letter under reply.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

Viceroy's Camp,
November 26th, 1939
27

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of the 18th November. I quite understand your anxiety to publish your letter to me of the 5th November and my acknowledgment of it. I should welcome it if you could postpone publication for, say, another ten days, as I am anxious that the interval between publication by you and my reply (which naturally must take some little time to prepare as I have to consult His Majesty's Government) should be as short as possible. But if you feel that it is essential for you to publish without waiting so long, I can raise no objection, though I would ask you to be kind enough to let me know in advance the date you contemplate.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

TELEGRAM

From Mr. Jinnah, Bombay.

To Lord Linlithgow, New Delhi.

Dated the 29th November 1939

Hope my letter eighteenth has reached your Excellency am waiting for reply as soon as possible.

TELEGRAM

M. A. Jinnah, Esq.
Little Gibbs Road,
Malabar Hill, Bombay,
29th November, 1939

Many thanks for your telegram of today. I hope you will by now have received my letter of 27th November posted from Bahawalpur—VICEROY.

* * *

Viceroy's Camp, India,
Calcutta, December 23rd, 1939

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I am now in a position to reply to your letter of November 5th, in which you submitted certain points for my consideration. You will, I am sure, appreciate that more than one of your questions, if considered in the light of all the implications involved in it, would raise issues affecting other communities in India, and that this correspondence between us would not be an appropriate medium for making pronouncements on them. But I hope that my answers, limited though their scope may be by this consideration, will none-the-less serve to remove your difficulties.

2. My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on October 18th last does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based.

3. With reference to your second point, I can assure you that His Majesty's Government are not under any misapprehension as to the importance of the contentment of the Muslim community to the stability and success of any constitutional developments in India. You need therefore have no fear that the weight which your community's position in India necessarily gives their views will be understood.

4. In framing their policy for Palestine, His Majesty's Government have endeavoured to meet all reasonable Arab demands, and they continue to be fully alive to the importance of that issue.

5. Finally you asked for an assurance that Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim power or country. This question is fortunately hypothetical, since His Majesty is not at war with any Muslim power. You will appreciate, however, that it is imposible to give a guarantee in terms so wide as those of your letter, which would have the effect of limiting India's right to use its own army in its own defence in circumstances which cannot now be foreseen; in the present situation, however, as you are aware, every precaution has been taken by His Majesty's Government

at the instance of the Government of India to ensure that Muslim feeling in India on this matter is fully respected.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

10, Aurangzeb Road,
New Delhi, 6th February, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am herewith sending a copy of the Working Committee's resolution passed on the 3rd of February, 1940, regarding the correspondence that has passed between Your Excellency and myself for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

RESOLUTION

To

H. E. Lord Linlithgow,
Viceroy and Governor-General of India,
New Delhi.

Passed at the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League held at Gul--i-Raana, Hardinge Avenue, New Delhi, on the 3rd and 4th of February, 1940, under the Presidentship of Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League considered the correspondence that has passed between Mr. Jinnah, the President, and His Excellency the Viceroy, ending with his final reply dated 23rd December 1939. The Committee is of the opinion that the reply of His Excellency is not satisfactory as certain important points still require further clarification and elucidation. The Committee, therefore, empowers the President to place the views of the Working Committee before His Excellency and request him to reconsider the matter regarding the assurances asked for in the resolution of the Working Committee dated the 18th of September and the 22nd of October, 1939, and thereby remove all doubts and apprehensions from the mind of Muslim India.

* * *

New Delhi, February 23rd, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I placed the whole correspondence that had passed between Your Excellency and myself, ending with your letter dated December 23, 1939, before the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League on February 3, 1940.

As was desired by Your Excellency in our conversation on February 6, I now beg to state

briefly the views of the Working Committee, which are as follows:—

The Working Committee appreciate the clarification made by Your Excellency regarding the first point and are glad to note that the declaration made by Your Excellency, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, on October 18, 1939, does not exclude the examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based.

As regards the second point, the Working Committee do not feel satisfied as the request made for a definite assurance has not been met, namely, that no declaration should, either in principle or otherwise, be made or any constitution be enforced by His Majesty's Government or enacted by Parliament without the approval and consent of the Mussalmans of India. We recognise Your Excellency's assurance when you state "His Majesty's Government are not under any misapprehension as to the importance of the contentment of the Muslim community to the stability and success of any constitutional development in India. You need therefore, have no fear that the weight which your community's position in India necessarily gives their views, will be underrated." But I regret to say, this does not meet the point raised by the Muslim League, because it still leaves the position of the ninety million Mussalmans of India only in the region of consultation and counsel, and vests the final decision in the hands of Great

Britain to determine the fate and future of Muslim India. We regret that we cannot accept this position.

As to the policy for Palestine, the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League wish to impress upon His Majesty's Government that a solution should be found to the satisfaction of the Arabs. The Committee are glad to note, as Your Excellency states, that His Majesty's Government have endeavoured to meet all reasonable Arab demands, and they continue to be fully alive to that issue. But the eyes of the Muslim world are watching the situation keenly and a definite solution should be found without delay.

With regard to the use of Indian troops against any Muslim Power or country, the Committee feel that Your Excellency has misunderstood the position. When we asked for an assurance that Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim Power or country, it was not intended that they shall not be used for the defence of the country in case of an attack on, or aggression against India. While we thank Your Excellency for informing us that every precaution has been taken by His Majesty's Government, at the instance of the Government of India, to insure that Muslim feeling in India on this matter is fully respected we feel that further clarification of the position is necessary.

It is required of the Muslim League to give assurance of wholehearted co-operation and active support on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to the British Government for the purpose of prose-

cution of the war. The Committee are of opinion that before doing that they must feel confident that the future of the Mussalmans of India is not left in the region of uncertainty or doubtful possibility. Consequently, we do not consider it unreasonable on our part to ask for a definite assurance that no commitments will be made with regard to the future constitution of India or any interim settlement with any other party without our approval and consent. If His Majesty's Government are prepared to treat the leadership of the Mussalmans as a responsible body, then they must be trusted, especially where the question of determining their own future is concerned.

We are constrained to state that Your Excellency is unnecessarily over-anxious about the interests of other communities. It has never been our desire unjustly to harm any community. The issues that have been raised by us are due to apprehensions that the British Government may be stampeded by other powerful organisations in the country into adopting a course or agreeing to a settlement in the matter of India's constitution which may prove not only highly detrimental to the interests of the Mussalmans but may be disastrous for them.

As regards Palestine and the use of Indian troops, our demands, as explained by me above, cannot in any way prejudice the interests of any other community. It is not possible in a letter of this kind to state fully the various reasons and details; but, if Your Excellency so desires, I shall be very glad to place the views of the Committee

before you in fuller details at an early date, whenever Your Excellency finds it convenient.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

April 19, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I was glad to gather from your letter of February 24, that my letter to you of December 23 had removed some of the doubts, which had been felt by the All-India Muslim League. I do not read your letter as indicating that the Working Committee of the League expects anything further from me in your points—the scope of the examination of the constitutional position to follow war and the policy in Palestine.

You ask, however, for further clarification of the position in regard to the use of Indian troops against Muslim Powers or countries, while explaining, as I note and appreciate, that you had no intention of attempting to circumscribe their use in defending India against attack or aggression. I presume that you do not expect a guarantee, which it would obviously be impossible to give, binding us in future contingencies which no one can foresee,

But you need have no fear that if at any time such a contingency arose the consideration underlying your suggestion would be overlooked. Fortunately, however, so far as the present situation is concerned, His Majesty's Government are in friendly and sympathetic relations with all Muslim Powers to some of whom indeed they are bound by alliance, while with the rest they are on terms of most cordial friendship.

You represent that your second point was not felt by the Working Committee to be adequately met by the terms of my letter. You have no doubt noticed the passage in the Secretary of State's speech on April 18 in which he used these words :

"But that does not mean that the future constitution of India is to be a constitution dictated by the Government and Parliament of this country against the wishes of the Indian people. The undertaking given by His Majesty's Government to examine the constitutional field in consultation with representatives of all parties and interests in India connotes not dictation but negotiation. Admittedly a substantial measure of agreement amongst the communities in India is essential if the vision of a united India, which has inspired the labours of so many Indians and Englishmen, is to become a reality; for I cannot believe that any Government or Parliament in this country would attempt to impose by force upon, for example, 80 million Muslim subjects of His Majesty in India, a form of constitution under which they would not live peacefully and contentedly".

This statement, I am sure you will agree, has removed any possible doubts on this point.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

Matheran, May 18, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of April 19, 1940, and I thank you for it. I hope you will excuse me for the delay in replying to it before now, as I was uncertain as to what course I should adopt in the matter, especially as the appointment of the personnel of the Working Committee was pending; but I now beg to inform you that I propose to place the matter before the Working Committee constituted for the ensuing year for their consideration and will communicate their views to Your Excellency as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Bombay, June 17, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolution passed by the Working Committee on

June 16, at its sitting in Bombay, and if you desire to discuss it further or require my presence I shall be glad to meet you.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Proceedings of the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League held on June 15, 16 and 17, 1940 at Bombay :—

Resolved : The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, while being of the opinion that further clarification contained in the letter of His Excellency the Viceroy, dated April 19, 1940, with regard to the assurances asked for by the All-India Muslim League is not satisfactory, endorses the following from the statement issued by the President, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, on May 27, 1940 :

"Up to the present moment, we have not created any difficulty nor have we embarrassed the British Government in the prosecution of the war. The provinces where the Muslim League has a dominant voice have been left free to co-operate with the British Government, pending their consideration with regard to the assurances we have asked for, and in particular that the British Government should make no declaration regarding the future constitutional problems of India and the vital issues that have been raised in that connection without our approval and consent.

"Nevertheless, without prejudice to the adjustment of the larger issues later on, we were even willing, as far back as November last, to consider the proposal of the Viceroy to bring about an honourable and workable adjustment in the provincial field, which would have been followed up with our respresentatives being appointed to the Executive Council of the Central Government to the extent permissible within the framework of the present constitution and exitsing law. But this proposal was summarily rejected by Mr. Gandhi and the Congress.

"A similar attempt was again made by His Excellency early in February, which met with the same fate. Since then it seems that the Viceroy has been waiting for the Congress to pass its word.

"With regard to Mr. Amery's statement and the broadcast appeal of His Excellency the Viceroy, may I say that it is up to the British Government to show trust in Muslim leadership. There are many ways of doing so—and, as confident friends seek our wholehearted co-operation, we shall not fail."

The Working Committee looks with alarm at the growing menace of Nazi aggression which has been most ruthlessly depriving one nation after another of its liberty and freedom and regards the unprovoked attack by the Italian Government against the Allies as most unwarranted and immoral at a time when France was engaged in a brave struggle against very heavy odds.

The grave world situation demands serious efforts on the part of every Indian for the defence of his country, and the Working Committee calls upon the Government of India to prepare the country in an organised manner to meet every eventuality. The Committee is constrained to state that the proposals for the Defence of India indicated in the statement of Their Excellencies the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief, as well as the statements of some provincial Governors, are wholly inadequate to meet the urgent requirements of the situation. The Committee, therefore, authorises its President to enter into communication with His Excellency the Viceroy with a view to exploring the possibility of devising prompt and effective measures to mobilise the country's resources for the purpose of intensifying war efforts and the defence of India.

The Committee is of the view that, unless a satisfactory basis for close co-operation is agreed upon on an All-India basis and not province-wise between the Government and the Muslim League and such other parties as are willing to undertake the responsibility for the defence of the country in the face of imminent danger, the real purpose and objective will not be served and achieved. The Working Committee is of opinion that, in view of the immediate grave danger that is facing the country, real purpose will not be served by the Mussalmans and others merely joining the proposed provincial and district war committees with their present scope and functions.

* * *

Simla, July 1, 1940

Dear Mr. Laithwaite,

I am enclosing herewith a rough note of the points I discussed with him on June 27, 1940, in the course of my interview.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

NOTE: That no pronouncement or statement should be made by His Majesty's Government which would, in any way, militate against the basic and fundamental principles laid down by the Lahore resolution of division of India and creating Muslim States in the North-west and Eastern zones; and it may be stated that that ideal now has become the universal faith of Muslim India.

That His Majesty's Government must give definite and categorical assurances to the Mussalmans of India that no interim or final scheme of new constitution would be adopted by the British Government without the previous approval of Muslim India.

In view of the rapid developments in Europe and grave danger that is facing India, it is fully realised that everything should be done that is possible to intensify war efforts and mobilise all

the resources of India for her defence for the purpose of maintaining internal security, peace and tranquillity, and to ward off external aggression. But this can only be achieved provided the British Government are ready and willing to associate the Muslim leadership as equal partners in the Government both at the Centre and in all the provinces. In other words, Muslim India leadership must be fully trusted as equals, and have equal share in the authority and control of the Governments, Central and Provincial.

Provisionally and during the period of the war the following steps should be taken to comply with the formula, namely, co-operation with the Government with equal share in the authority of the Government.

(a) That the Executive Council of the Viceroy should be enlarged, within the framework of the present constitutional existing law, the additional number to be settled by further discussions, but *it being understood that the Muslim representation must be equal to that of the Hindus if the Congress comes in, otherwise they should have the majority of the additional members, as it is obvious that the main burden and the responsibility will be borne by the Mussalmans in that case.*

(b) In the provinces where Section 93 has to operate, non-official advisers should be appointed, the number to be fixed after further discussion, and the majority of the non-official advisers should be the representatives of Mussalmans; and where

the provinces can be run by combination of parties or 'coalition', naturally it would be for the parties concerned to adjust matters by agreement among themselves.

(c) There should be a War Council consisting of not less than fifteen members, including the President, to be presided over by His Excellency the Viceroy. I don't like the expression "War Consultative Committee." This Council should regularly meet to deal with, any review, the general situation as it may develop from time to time, and advise the Government with regard to matters in connection with the prosecution of the war generally, and in particular, the fullest development of the defence possible, and finance, and to make a thorough economic and industrial drive. In this body it will not be difficult to secure the representation and full co-operation of the Indian Princes, and as far as I can judge, they would have no difficulty in joining it. It is through this body that the association of the Princes can be secured. Here again, the representation of Muslim India must be equal to that of the Hindus if the Congress comes in, otherwise they should have the majority.

Finally, the representatives of the Mussalmans on the proposed War Council and the Executive Council of the Governor-General, and the additional non-official advisers of the Governors, should be chosen by the Muslim League.

* * *

Simla, July 6, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I am much obliged for the private and personal memorandum headed "tentative proposal" which you were kind enough to send me in your letter to my Private Secretary on July I. I note the points taken in paragraph one of that memorandum, and in the first sentence of paragraph two, both of which you emphasised in our recent conversation. I welcome also the amplification, as putting me in fuller possession of your mind, of that conversation represented by the balance of your letter. But certain of the points suggest that there may be some slight misapprehension, which you will, I think, agree that it would be desirable that I should clear without delay.

As regards the expansion of my Executive Council, this would, as you rightly observe in your memorandum, be within the existing constitutional scheme. In other words, any Council so expanded would co-operate as a whole and as a single Government of India. It is not a case of striking a balance between the different interests or of preserving the proportions between the important parties. As you yourself indicated in the course of our conversation, there are parties other than either Congress or the Muslim League who may fairly claim to be considered for inclusion, and there is a very definite limit of numbers to any possible expansion.

At the same time I really accept the importance, in the event of any expansion, of securing adequate representation of Muslim interests, and that is a point which I would bear in mind. There is, however, as you will see from my explanation, no question of responsibility falling in greater or less degree on any particular section. Responsibility will be that of the Governor-General-in-Council as a whole. Again, it will be clear that under the existing law and practice it must remain with the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Governor-General's Executive Council, and such persons cannot be the nominees of political parties, however important; though it may, of course, be assumed that both the Secretary of State and the Governor-General would, in all cases, do their utmost to select persons from the various sections of the community.

I need not remind you that under law the whole responsibility for Government in section 93 provinces vests exclusively in the Governor, although a Governor can, of course, take advantage of the assistance of any advisers he may appoint. Whether, and if so at what point and in what strength, non-official advisers from political parties should be appointed in provinces under section 93 administration, in the event of an expansion of the Governor-General's Council, would clearly call for consideration in the light of circumstances of each province. You will, I think, agree with me also that the importance of the community from which advisers are drawn in a particular province has a direct bearing.

Your idea for a War Council is, in my view, well worthwhile considering, though details would have to be worked out. Here again there are, of course, many parties to be considered other than the Muslim League or Congress.

As regards section III of your memorandum, I ought, I think, to make it clear that it would be constitutionally impossible for the choice of Muslim gentlemen to be appointed to any expanded Executive Council or as non-official advisers to rest with the Muslim League. But in the contingency envisaged you need not fear that any suggestions you may put forward would not receive full consideration.

Let me in conclusion thank you again for your very clear and valuable memorandum. I realise, of course, fully that it is not merely private and personal, but that, in your own words, it embodies a tentative proposal. I am sure that you will agree with me that it is well that there should be no misunderstanding on the important points on which I have touched above.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

Bombay, July 17, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of July 6, 1940, and thank you for it.

As regards the constitutional and legal position that you have been good enough to point out to me in connection with the expansion of the Executive Council, and also with regard to the appointment of advisers to the Governor and the position of the Governor, working under Section 93 I fully appreciate it.

I am glad that the idea of constituting a War Council, in your opinion, is well worthwhile considering. No doubt the details would have to be worked out. But I do not think there is anything in my memorandum which cannot be given effect to by way of convention and, if the Secretary of State and yourself meet us in the spirit of trust and co-operation, the legal and constitutional formalities can be met and complied with. What is required is the spirit of complete understanding.

I am, however, grateful to you for your assurance in paragraph five of your letter, with regard to the choice of Muslim gentlemen to be appointed to the Executive Council or as non-official advisers, which runs as follows; "But in the contingency envisaged you need not fear that any suggestion you may put forward would not receive full consideration." On my part, I hope that I shall meet you in every reasonable way possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Viceroy's letter to Mr. Jinnah *en route* to Poona.

August 5, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have had the advantage of recent discussion with you in regard to the general political situation in India, and I have reported our conversations on that matter to His Majesty's Government, with whom also I have been in consultation as to the desirability of some further statement designed to remove misunderstandings and further to clarify their intentions in the constitutional field. I am glad to say that I have now been authorised to make the statement of which I enclose a copy. It will be published in the morning papers of Thursday August 8, and I would ask you to treat it as entirely secret and for your personal information until then.

As you will see His Majesty's Government have authorised me to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join my Executive Council, and they have authorised me further to establish a War Advisory Council which would meet at regular intervals and which would contain representatives of the Indian States and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole. I trust sincerely that you and the organisation of which you are the President will be prepared to join with me in the Central Government and in the War

Advisory Council; and I would greatly appreciate it if you are able to let me have a reply by August 21 at the latest. I would hope to have an opportunity of conversation with you in Bombay on August 13, and I suggest that this would be a convenient opportunity to clear the ground for your formal reply. I would only add that I am anxious that the names of the expanded Executive Council should appear not later than the end of August, and those of the War Advisory Council by the middle of September at the latest and if possible earlier than that date.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

August 14, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I think it may be convenient for you to have in writing the information on the points below which I gave you in our conversation today. I informed you in that conversation first that my statement clearly safeguarded the Muslim position in relation to future constitutional development: secondly, that I equally provided a basis on which the Muslims could, if they so desired, co-operate at the Centre. As I explained to you in our earlier conversation, I cannot yet take up the issue of the

provinces : but I do not contemplate non-official advisers at any rate at this stage.

You asked me the probable strength of the expanded Executive Council I cannot, for reasons which you will appreciate, yet indicate a precise figure, but the total strength of the Council will be likely to be in the neighbourhood of 11. If, as I trust, the Muslim League are prepared to accept my invitation, I would like you to let me have a panel of names, say four, with a view to my selecting two from it for appointment to my Council. As I have already made clear to you, Sir Zafrulla Khan, if he remains in my Council, will not count against this figure. It is clearly impossible until the discussions on which I am at present engaged are complete to indicate precisely what would be the parties represented in the expanded Council.

The strength and composition of the War Advisory Council can clearly only be fixed after the expansion of the Executive Council is complete. Here, too, I should be grateful if you would be good enough to let me have a panel of names for my consideration on the assumption that there would probably be, say, five Muslim League representatives out of a total of something in the neighbourhood of 20.

As you will appreciate, I am very anxious to take very early decisions in these matters and to reach finality as regards the personnel of the expanded Executive Council and of the Advisory Council at as early a date as possible, and I hope

that you will be able to assist me by letting me have a very early reply.

There is, of course, no objection whatever to your communicating the information above to your colleagues confidentially, but I should be grateful if any publicity could be avoided for the present.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

Simla, September 25, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I duly received the resolutions of the Working Committee of the Muslim League passed at their meetings in Bombay, on September 2.

I have, I think, made the general position perfectly clear in the course of our conversation, and it is unnecessary for me to enter into further detail about it here. As regards certain specific matters, I would, however, put on record that I explained to you the constitutional reasons which make it essential that the choice of members of the Governor-General's Executive Council must rest exclusively with the Governor-General and the Secretary of State, with whom it must rest to tender advice

in this matter to His Majesty. I appreciate, however, the difficulties which, you made it clear to me, confronted you in connection with the formation of the panel which I had earlier suggested to you, and in the light of our discussion I am content that the selection of representatives, while resting with the Governor-General, should be based, in the case of the Muslim League (and, should they so desire, of the other parties to be represented in my Council) not on a panel formally submitted, but on confidential discussion between the leader of the party concerned and myself.

I have also indicated the impracticability of a final decision as to the total strength of the expanded Council or as to the allocation of portfolios (a matter which must, of course, rest entirely with the Governor-General) until the replies of all those who may be invited to serve have been received. But I have made clear to you (as I have also to the leaders of the other parties whom I have recently seen) my attitude on both those issues.

The general position of His Majesty's Government had been made clear in my statement of August 8 and in the Secretary of State's speech in the House of Commons on August 15, it is that His Majesty's Government regard the expansion of my Council and the constitution of a War Advisory Council as steps of the first importance in terms of the association of Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government and of the constitutional machinery of the Government

of India pending the post-war investigations, the machinery for which has been indicated in my statement and in Mr. Amery's speech. His Majesty's Government sincerely trust that the Muslim League, like the other parties and interests which they have invited to join the expanded Council and to participate in the War Advisory Council, will respond to that invitation. Their collaboration in both those bodies will, of course, be entirely without prejudice to the consideration and decision after the conclusion of the war, and on the basis already indicated in my statement, of the main constitutional issue. But His Majesty's Government trust and anticipate that they and the other parties who are represented in the expanded Council and the War Advisory Council will welcome the opportunity offered to them of influencing the cause of public affairs in the immensely important period which lies ahead, and, in so doing, will, in the working throughout the period of the war of those bodies, find a basis for that general co-operation, with full regard to the interests of all concerned, on which the post-war constitution foreshadowed in my statement and in the Secretary of State's speech can be built.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

New Delhi, September 26, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 25,

1940, in reply to the resolution of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League on September 2, which was despatched to you with my covering letter of September 5.

I shall place the matter before the Committee on September 28, and let you have the reply as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Simla September 25, 1940

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

You asked me yesterday to let you have a formal reply before you left for Delhi to the resolutions which you were kind enough to send me earlier this month, and I accordingly send you a formal letter herewith. I have given the most careful consideration since we parted last night as to whether I could devise any form of words such as you mentioned to me which would meet the purpose which you had in view. I warned you, as you will remember, that I anticipated the greatest difficulty in doing so, and I am bound to confess with regret that I have in fact after the most careful thought found it impracticable. But, knowing your mind as I do, I have endeavoured in the last paragraph of my formal letter sent herewith to do what I could

to make the general position clear, and I hope that that may be of assistance to you. I trust that in the light of our talks you will now be able to let me have a definite decision once your meeting at Delhi is over, and I trust that that decision may be a favourable one; for matters have now reached a stage at which it is essential that a definite conclusion should be reached.

Yours sincerely,

Linlithgow

* * *

New Delhi, September 26, 1940

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I thank you for your letter of September 25 and I extremely regret that you are unable to meet me on the point which I raised during the course of our conversation on the 24th, though in the course of the discussions you appreciated and recognised that it was a vital point so far as the Muslim League was concerned, namely, that in the event of any other party deciding later on to be associated with your Executive Council to assist in the prosecution of war it should be allowed to do so on terms that may be approved of and consented to by the Muslim League party, as we were entering into, so to say, a "war contract".

I thank you for your endeavour in the last paragraph of your formal letter to do what you could to make the general position clear, but, I am afraid, it does not meet the point raised by me and I cannot derive much assistance from it.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

—O—

M. K. GANDHI

Mr. M. A. Jinnah sent Mr. B. G. Kher with a Special message to Gandhiji about Hindu-Muslim Unity. Mr. Kher saw Gandhiji at Tithal. As a result of their conversation Gandhiji addressed the following letter to Mr. Jinnah from Tithal :

Tithal, May 22, 1937

Dear Shri Jinnah,

Kher has given me your message. I wish I could do something but I am utterly helpless. My faith in Unity is as bright as ever ; only I see no daylight out of the impenetrable darkness, and in such distress I cry out to God for light.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

* * *

Another letter to Mr. Jinnah

Segaon, October 19, 1937

I carefully went through your speech at Lucknow, and I felt deeply hurt over your misunderstanding of my attitude. My letter was in answer to a specially private message you had sent to me.

It represented my deepest feeling. That letter was purely personal, were you right in using it as you did?

"As I read it, the whole of your speech is a declaration of war. Only, I had hoped you would reserve poor me as a bridge between the two. I see that you want no bridge. I am sorry. It takes two to make a quarrel. You won't find me one, even if I cannot become a peace-maker.

"This is not for publication, unless you desire it. It is written in all good faith and out of an anguished heart."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

Bombay, November 5, 1937

"I am of opinion that I was fully justified in publishing your letter from Tithal last May; I am of opinion that I was fully justified in doing so; but your letter means something different from what I understand it to mean. Surely it was open to you to offer your explanation to the public. The letter was not marked as it is usual to do so when its publication is not desired by the writer, and my message to you was not private. Even now you do not indicate how I have misunderstood your attitude or the contents of that letter.

"I am sorry you think my speech at Lucknow is declaration of war. It is purely in self-defence. Kindly read it again and try and understand it.

Evidently you have not been following the course of events of the last twelve months.

"As to reserving you as a 'bridge' and 'peace-maker', don't you think your complete silence for all these months has identified you with the Congress leadership, although I know that you are not even a four-anna member of that body.

"I regret to say that I find nothing definite or any constructive proposal in your letter under reply, except that it is written in all good faith and out of an anguished heart which I reciprocate."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah

Segaon, February 3, 1938

"Pandit Nehru told me yesterday that you were complaining to the Maulana Sahib about the absence of any reply from me to your letter of November 5 in reply to mine of October 19. The letter was received by me when I was pronounced by the doctors to be seriously ill in Calcutta. The letter was shown to me three days after its receipt. Had I thought it necessarily called for a reply, even though I was ill I would have sent one. I have re-read the letter. I still think that there was nothing useful that I could have said in reply. But, in a way, I am glad that you awaited a reply. Here it is.

"Mr. Kher told me definitely that he had a private mesasge from you. He delivered it to me

when I was alone. I could have sent you a verbal message in reply; but, in order to give you a true picture of my mental state, I sent you the short note. There was nothing to hide in it; but I did feel, as I still do, that the way in which you used it came upon me as a painful surprise.

"You complain of my silence. The reason for my silence is literally and truly in my note. Believe me, the moment I can do something that can bring the two communities together nothing in the world can prevent me from so doing.

"You seem to deny that your speech was a declaration of war, but your later pronouncements too confirm the first impression. How can I prove what is a matter of feeling? In your speeches I miss the old nationalist. When in 1915 I returned from the self-imposed exile in South Africa, everybody spoke of you as one of the staunchest of nationalists and the hope of both Hindus and Muslims. Are you still the same Mr. Jinnah? If you say you are, in spite of your speeches, I shall accept your word.

"Lastly, you want me to come forward with some proposal. What proposal can I make except to ask you on bended knees to be what I had thought you were. But the proposals, to form a basis of unity between the two communities, has surely got to come from you.

"This is again not for publication, but for your eyes. It is the cry of a friend, not of an opponent."

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi.

New Delhi, February 15, 1938

"I did not complain to the Maulana Sahib about the absence of any reply from you. I only mentioned the facts, as he was anxious that we two should meet. Anyhow, I am glad to hear from you.

"My message to you through Mr. Kher, as I informed you in my last letter, was not private. It was only when Mr. Kher went to see you at Wardha that I did say that he should not mention the matter to any one except you and that if you yourself were inclined in the first instance to take up the matter, then it would be more than half the battle won. On his return to Bombay Mr. Kher told me that it was difficult for you to give a reply as you were restricted not to disclose it to any one or consult anybody else.

Thereupon I said that it was not intended to be a secret and that he was free and you were free to put your heads together and let me know whether at that juncture you were inclined to take up this matter with the powerful and overwhelming influence which you exercise over the Congress.

"Then he saw you again at Tithal and from that moment it ceased to be a private matter between two individuals; and he brought me your reply in writing which I had to publish, because

you know of the controversy between me and Babu Rajendra Prasad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the Press where it was sought to make out that I was putting every obstacle in the way of a Hindu-Muslim settlement.

"As your letter was not marked confidential, I used it. Besides, what is wrong in my saying that I had approached you on my own accord and that was the reply I received from you. I cannot understand why you feel so much about it.

"You say that I complained of your silence. Well, I do. But you further proceed to say: 'Believe me the moment I can do something that can bring the two communities together, nothing in the world can prevent me from so doing.' Now, what am I to gather from this? Am I right in interpreting that the moment is not come?

"With regard to your opinion that my speech at the Lucknow session and my later pronouncements, which you are pleased to call a declaration of war, I can only repeat that it is in self-defence. Evidently you are not acquainted with what is going on in the Congress press: The amount of vilification, misrepresentation and falsehood that is daily spread about me—otherwise, I am sure, you would not blame me.

"You say that when in 1915 you returned from South Africa everybody spoke of me as one of staunchest of nationlists and the hope of both the Hindus and Muslims, and you ask me a question,

'Are you still the same Jinnah?' And proceed further to say, 'If you say you are, in spite of your speeches, I shall accept your word.' And you say that in my speeches you miss the old nationalist. Do you think that you are justified in saying that? I would not like to say what people spoke of you in 1915 and what they speak and think of you today. Nationalism is not the monoploy of any single individual, and in these days it is very difficult to define it; but I don't wish to pursue this line of controversy any further.

"You conclude by saying, 'Lastly you want me to come forward with some proposal. What proposal can I make except to ask you on bended knees to be what I had thought you were; but the proposals, to form the basis of unity between the two communities, have surely got to come from you.' I think you might have spared your appeal and need not have preached to me on your bended knees to be what you had thought I was.

"As regards the formulation of proposals which would form the basis of unity, do you think that this can be done by correspondence. Surely you know as much as I do what are the fundamental points in dispute. In my opinion, it is as much up to you to suggest ways and means of tackling the problem. If you genuinely and sincerely desire and you feel that the moment has come for you to step in and with your position and influence you are prepared to take the matter up earnestly, I will not fail to render all the assistance I can."

Letter from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah.

Segaon, February 24, 1938

"I have read your letter to Jawaharlal also I observe that both the letters invite not written replies but a personal discussion. I do not know whether it will take place in the first instance between you and Jawaharlal or, now that Subhas Bose succeeds him, between you and the latter. If you desire that before this there should be a talk between you and me, I would be delighted to see you in Segaon any time which is convenient to you before March 10, after which, if health permits, I might have to go to Bengal. So far as I am concerned, just as on the Hindu-Muslim question I was guided by Dr. Ansari, now that he is no more in our midst, I have accepted Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as my guide. My suggestion, therefore, to you is that conversation should be opened in the first instance as between you and the Maulana Sahib. But in every case regard me as at your disposal."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi.

New Delhi, March 3, 1938

"In your letter I missed the note of response: First, whether you are of opinion that you see light now and the moment has come, and, secondly, if so, whether you are prepared to take the matter up in right earnest.

"I find that there is no change in your attitude and mentality when you say you would be guided by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad as Dr. Ansari is no more. If you pursue this line you will be repeating the same tragedy as you did when you expressed your helplessness because Dr. Ansari, holding pronounced and die-hard views, did not agree, and you had to say that you were willing, but what could you do. This happened, as you know, before you went to the Round Table Conference.

"At the Round Table Conference the tragedy was repeated by you when you seemed to be willing to accept provisionally certain terms: but you, there also, expressed that you were helpless as the Hindus were unwilling and you, as a representative of the Congress, would have no objection if the Hindus and Muslims came to an agreement.

"We have reached a stage where no doubt should be left that you recognise the All-India Muslim League as the one authoritative and representative organisation of the Muslims of India and, on the other hand, you represent the Congress and other Hindus throughout the country. It is only on that basis that we can proceed further and devise a machinery of approach.

"Of course, I shall be glad to see you, although I shall be equally glad to see Pandit Jawaharlal or Mr. Bose as you may desire. The matter, as you know, will not be clinched without reference again to you by either of them. Therefore, I will prefer to see you first. In any case, I am sorry to say

that I cannot come to Segaon to see you before March 10. I have to go to Bombay and also I have fixed various other engagements of my tour; but we can fix up the time and place that may suit us both."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah

Segaon, March 8

"Your letter revives painful memories. I will not discuss at this stage, at any rate, the various debatable points raised in your letter. Suffice it to say that I am at your disposal. If you cannot come to Segaon and my health permits, I will gladly go to Bombay to meet you when you are there. At present I have to go to Bengal and then for a while to Orissa. This will take me through the whole of this month. The earliest, therefore, that we can meet will be in April.

"Two questions arising from your letter demand a reply. You ask me whether I have now seen the light. Much to my regret, I have to say, 'No.' If I had, I would proclaim the news from the house-tops; but that limitation does not debar me from taking advantage of the slightest opportunity of finding a way out of the present difficulty.

"You expect me to be able to speak on behalf of 'the Congress and other Hindus throughout the country.' I am afraid I cannot fulfil the test. I cannot represent either the Congress or the Hindus

in the sense you mean; but I would exert to the utmost all the moral influence I could have with them in order to secure an honourable settlement."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

New Delhi, March 17, 1938

"As you do not wish to discuss the various points mentioned in my letter and the two questions which you have answered are far from hopeful, I am helpless. However, as you say, 'Suffice it to say that I am at your disposal,' I gather, you would nevertheless like to take advantage of the slightest opportunity of finding a way out of the present difficulty. In these circumstances, I beg to inform you that I shall be glad to see you in Bombay some time in April as suggested by you."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah

Calcutta, March 24, 1938

"Many thanks for your note. As soon as I reach Segaon I shall seek the first opportunity of waiting on you in Bombay."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

New Delhi, March 26, 1938

"I thank you for your letter of March 24, 1938, and I shall be very glad to see you after my return from Calcutta about April 25, at Bombay."

Telegram from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah

Delhi, April 15, 1938

"If on your return to Bombay you can break journey at Wardha for one day, you will spare me the strain of undertaking a journey to Bombay. I need some uninterrupted physical rest if possible. In any event, could Maulana Abul Kalam Azad accompany me at the interview? Please wrire to Wardha which place I am reaching tomorrow."

* * *

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

Calcutta, April 16, 1938

"I am extremely sorry I am unable to change my programme now. I will receive you at Bombay on the 25th or thereafter as arranged. I would prefer to see you alone."

* * *

Telegram from Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Jinnah

Wardha, April 18, 1938

"Thanks. The 25th happens to be Monday. I will reach Bombay on the 28th if it is not inconvenient to you."

* * *

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi

Calcutta, April 19, 1938

"Thanks. I will gladly receive you on the 28th at my house."

Letter from Mr. Mr. Gandhi

January 16, 1940

'Dear Quaid-e-Azam',

I hate to write 'Mr.' before any Indian name. It is so unnatural. Hence I have been writing of you as 'Janab Jinnah Sahib', acording to the usage taught me by the late Hakim Sahib. But Abul Kalam tells me that in the League Circles you are always called "Quaid-e-Azam."—And you will see from the enclosed how the finishing touch was given by a telegram I received from Gulburga. I hope you will accept my assurance that what I have done, has been done in good faith and out of regard for you. If, however, you would have me address you otherwise, I shall respect your wishes.

The purpose of writing this letter is to send you the enclosed advance copy of the article I have sent to the *Harijan.* I have written it to further the end I have read in your recent messages and actions. I know that you are quite capable of rising to the height required for the noble motive attributed to you. I do not mind your opposition to the Congress. But your plan to amalgamate all the parties opposed to the Congress at once gives your movement a national character. If you succeed you will free the country from communal incubus, and in my humble opinion give a lead to the Muslims and others for which you will deserve the gratitude not only of the Muslims

but of all the other communities. I hope that my interpretation is correct. If I am mistaken you will please correct me.

It is purely personal, private, friendly letter. But you are free to make public use of it if you think it necessary.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. Gandhi

Enclosed article :

'A WELCOME MOVE'

On the Deliverance Thanks-giving Day, declared by Jinnah Sahib, I had the following wire from Gulburga Muslims :

"Deliverance Day greetings, Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah Zindabad".

I took it as a message sent to ruffle my feelings. The senders little knew that the wire could not serve its purpose. When I received it, I silently joined the senders in the wish. 'Long Live Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah.' The Quaid-i-Azam is an old comrade. What does it matter that to-day we do not see eye-to-eye in some matters? That can make no difference in my good-will towards him.

But the Quaid-i-Azam has given me special reason for congratulating him. I had pleasure of wiring him congratulations on his excellent Id-day broadcast. And now he commands further congratulations on forming pacts with parties who are opposed to the Congress policies and politics. He is thus lifting the Muslim League out of the communal rut and giving it a national character. I regard his step as perfectly legitimate. I observe that the Justice Party and Dr. Ambedkar's party have already joined Jinnah Sahib. The papers report too, that Shree Savarkar, the President of the Hindu Mahasabha is to see him presently. Jinnah Sahib himself has informed the public that many non-Congress Hindus have expressed their sympathy with him. I regard this development as thoroughly healthy. Nothing can be better than we should have in the country mainly two parties—the Congress and non-Congress or anti-Congress, if the latter expression is preferred. Jinnah Sahib is giving the word 'minority' a new and good content. The Congress majority is made up of a combination of caste Hindus, non-Caste Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis and Jews. Therefore, it is a majority drawn from all classes, representing a particular body of opinion, and the proposed combination becomes a minority representing another body of opinion. This may any day convert itself into a majority by commending itself to the electorate. Such an alignment of parties is a consummation devoutly to be wished. If the Quaid-i-Azam can bring about the combination, not only I but the whole of India will shout with one acclamation: "Long Live Quaid-i-

Azam Jinnah." For he will have brought about permanent and living Unity for which I am sure the whole nation is thirsting.

* * *

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay,
January 21, 1940

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of 16th January and the advance copy of the article you have sent to the *Harijan.* I not only thank you for your courtesy but also for your anxiety to further the end you have been reading in my messages and actions. I, however, regret to have to say that your premises are wrong as you start with the theory of an Indian Nation that does not exist, and naturally, therefore, your conclusions are wrong. I should have thought, however, that you at least would not be led away by one-sided newspaper reports and canards. There is so much in your article which is the result of imagination. It is due partly to the fact that you are living a secluded life at Segaon and partly because all your thoughts and actions are guided by "inner voice." You have very little concern with realities, or what might be termed by an ordinary mortal "practical politics." I sometimes wonder what can be common between practical politics and yourself, between democracy and the dictator of a political organisation of which he is not even a four-anna member. But that is,

I suppose, because you do not consider the Congress worthy of your membership.

I am glad to learn that you were not ruffled by the "Deliverance Day" greetings sent to you from Gulbarga. It was indeed noble of you to join in the silent prayer "Long live Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah." Although these are trivial matters, I nevertheless appreciate that you have realised the true inward meaning and significance of the "Deliverance Day."

It is true that many non-Congress Hindus expressed their sympathy with the Deliverance Day in justice to our cause, so also the leaders of the Justice party and the Scheduled Castes, and the Parsis who had suffered. But I am afraid that the meaning which you have tried to give to this alignment shows that you have not appreciated the true significance of it. It was partly a case of "adversity bringing strange bed-fellows together," and partly because common interest may lead Muslims and minorities to combine. I have no illusions in the matter, and let me say again that India is not a nation, nor a country. It is a sub-continent composed of nationalities, Hindus and Muslims being the two major nations. Today you deny that religion can be a main factor in determining a nation, but you yourself, when asked what your motive in life was, "the thing that leads us to do what we do," whether it was religious, or social, or political, said: "Purely religious!" This was

the question asked me by the late Mr. Montagu when I accompanied a deputation which was purely political. 'How you, social reformer,' he exclaimed 'have found your way into this crowd?' My reply was that it was only an extension of my social activity. I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of mankind, and that I could not do unless I took part in politics. The gamut of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, economic, political and purely religious work into watertight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activity. It provides a moral basis to all other activities which they would otherwise lack, reducing life to a maze of 'sound and fury signifying nothing'."

More than any one else, you happen to be the man today who commands the confidence of Hindu India and are in a position to deliver the goods on their behalf. It is too much to hope and expect that you might play your legitimate role and abandon your chase after a mirage? Events are moving fast, a campaign of polemics, or your weekly discourse in the *Harijan* on metaphysics, philosophy and ethics, or your peculiar doctrines regarding *khaddar*, *ahimsa* and spinning are not going to win India's freedom. Action and statesmanship alone will help us in our forward march. I believe that you might still rise to your stature in the service of our country and make your proper contribution towards leading India to contentment and happiness.

Lastly, I thank you for your anxiety to respect my wishes in the matter of the prefix you should use with my name. What is in a prefix after all, a rose called by any other name smells just as sweet. So I leave the matter entirely to you, and have no particular wish in the matter. I really do not know why you are worried so much about it. I, however, notice that the present prefix you are using is according to the usage taught to you by the late Hakim Sahib. But surprisingly enough during his lifetime and till long after his death, you addressed me as "Mr.", then quite recently you addressed me as "Shree", and in between as "friend", but please do not bother about this matter.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

—O—

PANDIT NEHRU

From Mr. Nehru to Mr. Jinnah.

Lucknow, January 18, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

I have read the statement you issued recently to the press with care. I am afraid we approach the question from differing viewpoints and I feel that your approach is not very helpful. But I entirely agree with you that an argument carried on through the medium of the press is not desirable. Indeed I had decided not to issue press statements on the subject, but after your Calcutta speech, in which you mentioned my name and issued some kind of a 'challenge' to me, I felt that a public statement was unavoidable. Hence my statement, in which I tried to avoid unnecessary controversy.

You know perhaps that for some months past I have been in correspondence with Nawab Ismail Khan on this subject and I have been anxious to find out what the points of difference and agreement were. I am afraid I do not know this yet and your last statement does not help. I would feel grateful to you if you could kindly throw some light on this and let me know what exactly are the points in dispute which require consideration.

I think this will help us all and lead to an avoidance of needless controversy. We can then come to grips with the subject. As I have said in my last statement, we are eager to do everything in our power to put an end to every misapprehension and to endeavour to solve every problem that comes in the way of our developing our public life along right lines and promoting the unity and progress of the Indian people.

I am leaving for Lahore today. From there I go to the Frontier Province and return to Allahabad in about ten days' time. Kindly address your reply to Allahabad.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

Bombay, January 25, 1938

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th January, 1938.

I must say that it is very difficult for me to understand it. I fail to see what you are driving at. It does not suggest any useful proposal of a concrete character, besides reapproaching me and informing me that "we approach the question from differing viewpoints," and you further say, "I feel that your approach is not very helpful."

You further refer to my Calcutta speech and say, "in which you mentioned my name and issued some kind of a 'challenge' to me, I felt that the public statement was unavoidable and hence my statement." But you do not even now give me the purport of my speech, and what was the 'challenge' which compelled you to say what you did in your statement which you considered unavoidable.

I know nothing about your being in correspondence with Nawab Ismail Khan referred to in your letter.

Finally I note your request that I should let you know "what exactly are the points in dispute which require consideration." I am glad that you agree with me that the arguments carried on through the medium of the press are not desirable. But do you now think that this matter can be discussed, much less solved, by and through correspondence? I am afraid that is equally undersirable.

I may state for your information that I received a letter from Mr. Gandhi, dated the 19th Oct., 1937, and I replied to him on the 5th November, '37, and I am still waiting to hear from him.

I reciprocate the sentiments expressed in the last but one paragraph of your letter at the end of it.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

Wardha, February 4, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Your letter of the 25th January reached Allahabad on February 1st after I had left. It has been forwarded to me here and reached me yesterday.

I am sorry that my previous letter was difficult to understand. My purpose in writing it was, as I stated, to find out what our points of difference and agreement were. Presumably there are points of difference as you have repeatedly criticised the Congress policy and practice. If these points of difference are noted down and our attention drawn to them it would make their consideration easier. It is possible that some of them may be due to misapprehension and this misapprehension might be removed; it is equally possible that some are more fundamental and then we could try to find a way out or, at any rate, know exactly how and where we stand. When there is a conflict of opinion, a clarification of the opposing opinions is an essential preliminary to their consideration.

I might mention some relatively minor matters which have apparently led to misapprehension. In one of your speeches you referred to being told by some one that a cheque for rupees five lakhs was recently given to the Congress. I am not aware of this and presumably I ought to know. Indeed, to my knowledge, no one has given even

a cheque for Rs. 5,000 to the Congress for a considerable time.

In the same, or possibly another, speech you referred to the non-co-operation days and stated that while the Aligarh University was forced to close down and many non-co-operated from it, not a single student non-co-operated from the Benares University. As a matter of fact a very large number of students did in fact non-co-operate from the Benares University. As a result of this a non-official university, the Kashi Vidyapitha, was established in Benares, as also the Gandhi Ashram. Both of these still exist. In the same way the Jamia Millia came into existence in Aligarh and this now flourishes in Delhi.

You have referred in your speeches to the Congress imposing Hindi-Hindustani and trying to crush Urdu. I presume you were misinformed for I am not aware of any attempt on the part of of the Congress to injure Urdu. Some time back I wrote an essay on "The Question of Language" which represents, I believe, the Congress viewpoint. It was approved by Mr. Gandhi and by many people unconnected with the Congress and interested in the advancement of Urdu, including Moulvi Abdul Huque, Secretary, Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu of Hyderabad. I do not know if you have come across this essay. In any event I am asking my office in Allahabad to send you a copy. If you disagree with the argument or conclusions of this essay, I shall be grateful to have your criticisms.

I might mention that the Congress Ministry in Madras is endeavouring to introduce the study of Hindustani in the State schools in the province. They are having primers and text-books prepared especially for the purpose by the Jamia Millia. These primers, etc., are to be in two scripts—Devanagri and Urdu—but in identical language the students having the option of script.

I mention these instances to show how misapprehensions arise. But the real questions at issue are more important and it is in regard to these that clarification is necessary. I presume you are acquainted with the Congress resolutions and statements on minority and fundamental rights and regarding communal questions. If you so wish it, I can have these sent to you. Many of these were collected together in a comprehensive resolution passed by the Working Committee in Calcutta towards the end of October 1937. About the Communal Award the Congress position has been repeatedly made clear.

The Congress policy as laid down in these resolutions may be incomplete or wrong. If so we shall gladly consider suggestions to complete it or rectify it. Personally I do not see what more can be done by the Congress regarding religious or cultural matters. As for political (communal) questions, the Communal Award, unsatisfactory as it is, holds the field for the present and till such time as it may be altered by mutual agreement of the parties concerned.

In considering wider political questions, the Congress has adhered to certain principles and policies for a number of years, though minor variations have taken place from time to time. Our present policy in the legislatures and outside was defined by a comprehensive resolution passed by the Working Committee at Wardha last year. I was very glad to find from Nawab Ismail Khan and Chowdhury Khaliquzzaman that the U.P. Muslim League, or the U.P. Muslim League Parliamentary Board, accepted this programme. This included our objective of independence, our demand for a constituent assembly, our general attitude to the Constitution Act, and the Federation, and our methods of work inside and outside the legislature. It referred also to our agrarian and labour programmes. Thus there appeared to be a very large measure of agreement between us not only in regard to fundamentals, but even regarding many details.

In view of this agreement it distressed and surprised me to find that there was so much conflict. I have tried, therefore, to find out what this conflict is about. I do not see how I can make any proposal, concrete or vague, when I do not know what the points in issue are. It is true that in reading your speeches I have come across various statements to the effect that the Congress is trying to establish Hindu raj. I am unaware of how this is being done or who is doing it. If any Congress Ministries or the Congress organisation have made mistakes, these should be pointed out to us.

A report of your Calcutta speech appeared in the newspapers at the time and is no doubt available to you and for me to give you a purport of it seemed hardly necessary. In this you state that you are fighting the Congress, that you are fighting the Congress leadership which is misleading the Hindus. Further you have said that you want to bring the Congress High Command to its senses. May I suggest that those who are privileged to advise or lead the Congress have no desire to fight any body except British Imperialism? In any event, if we mislead or misbehave we have a right to enquire from our critics where and how we have done so.

Further in your Calcutta speech you said: "I have long long ago, months ago now, thrown out a challenge to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and I throw out a challenge now,—let him come and sit with us and let us formulate a constructive programme which will give immediate relief to the poor." It was to this 'challenge' that I referred in my last letter. I do not remember on which previous occasion you had issued a similar challenge to me.

It is always helpful to discuss matters and problems face to face and, as I have said previously, we are always glad to do so. A short while ago you met Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, one of our most respected leaders, than who there is no one better fitted to explain the Congress view-point in regard to the minorities problem or any other matter. Whenever necessity arises every one of us will willingly welcome a talk. But even such a talk is likely to be vague and infructuous if some

clarification of ideas does not take place previously. Correspondence helps in this process and sometimes is even preferable as it is more precise than talk. I trust therefore that you will help in clarifying the position by telling us where we differ and how you would like this difference to end. You have also criticised the Congress is vigorous language, as you were no doubt entitled to do. But are we not entitled to ask you to substantiate those criticisms in private at least, if not in public ?

I have inquired from Mr. Gandhi about your letter to him dated the 5th November, 1937. He received it in Calcutta when he was lying ill there and he felt that it needed no answer. Your letter had been in answer to his and the matter seemed to end there for the time being. He was good enough to show me his letter and yours and it seemed to me that no particular reply was called for. I understand that he wrote you yesterday.

I hope to be in Allahabad by the 9th February.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru.

* * *

New Delhi, February 17, 1938

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 4th February. You have now flung at me more complaints

and grievances of trifling character. Evidently you rely on that section of the press which is bent on misrepresenting and vilifying me, but I am glad that you say I mention these instances to show how misapprehension arises : 'but the real question at issue is more important and it is in regard to this that clarification is necessary.' Therefore I don't think any useful purpose will be served to carry on correspondence with regard to the various matters mentioned in your letter. You will please not introduce matters which you may have discussed with Nawab Ismail Khan or Chaudhry Khaliquzzaman or any body else. These again will lead to references and cross references and the matter will never end.

As regards my Calcutta speech, the word 'challenge' is obviously due to the imagination of the reporter for the very context shows clearly that it was an invitation. However, the discussion of all these matters in correspondence will lead us nowhere. I do not believe in the doctrine which you lay down 'but are we not entitled to ask you to substantiate all these criticisms in private at least, if not in public' : I for my part make no such distinction. I am prepared to substantiate anything that I have said publicly, provided it is correctly reported. The crux of your letter on the real vital point of the Hindu-Muslim unity is a repetition of what you said in your previous letter, namely, that you want me to note down 'the points of difference' and discuss them through and by means of correspondence—a method, which I made it clear in my last letter, is highly

undesirable and most inappropriate. I welcome your suggestion when you say 'whenever necessity arises every one of us would willingly welcome a talk.' If you think that necessity has arisen and any one of you is willing, I shall be glad to see you and equally welcome a talk. The thing is that you prefer talking at each other whereas I prefer talking to each other. Surely you know and you ought to know what are the fundamental points in dispute.

I have received a letter from Mr. Gandhi and I have replied to him, a copy of which I am enclosing herewith.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Bombay, February 25, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Your letter of the 17th February reached me at Haripura. I had no intention of flinging any complaints and grievances at you. In my attempt to find out what your complaints were I read your speeches as reported in the newspapers (usually by a news agency) and noted down some of the points on which you had laid stress. I am glad to know that you have been misreported but you have not pointed out where the misrepresentation

comes in nor, so far as I know, have you issued any statement to the press correcting the misrepresentation. May I suggest that it will be worth while to correct these errors so that the public might not be misled. A clear and authoritative statement from you will help us also in understanding what you stand for and what you object to.

I note that you do not wish me to introduce in our correspondence any matters which we may have discussed with Nawab Ismail Khan or Chowdhry Khaliquzzaman. I did not know that they represented any different view-point from yours. I thought it necessary to draw your attention to the repeated attempts I have been making to find out what the political and communal policy of the Muslim League is and wherein it differs from that of the Congress. You will remember saying last year that the Muslim League had an entirely different policy even on political matters from that of Congress. Since then the League has changed its objective and its economic outlook and has thus approached nearer to the Congress. I am anxious to find out what the real meaning of these changes is. Without this clarification it is difficult for us to understand the present position.

You say that you do not believe in the doctrine that I lay down, namely : "but are we not entitled to ask you to substantiate all these criticisms in private at least, if not in public." Further you say that for your part you make no such distinction and are prepared to substantiate anything that you

have said publicly, provided it is correctly reported. If you will read my sentence again you will no doubt observe that I have nowhere laid down any such doctrine as you imagine. I would indeed welcome a public treatment by you of the criticisms made by you. But if you yourself were unwilling to write to the press on the subject, as you indicated in your letter, I put it to you that we are at least entitled to request you to substantiate the criticism in private.

If you have made no criticisms of the Congress, and the press reports are entirely wrong, then of course no question of substantiation arises. All that need be done is to contradict the press reports. But if criticisms have been made, as presumably they have been, then I would request you to justify them publicly or privately as you might choose. Personally I would prefer the former method.

I am afraid I must confess that I do not yet know what the fundamental points of dispute are. It is for this reason that I have been requesting you to clarify them. So far I have not received any help in this direction. Of course we shall willingly meet you whenever opportunity arises. Our President, Subhas Chandra Bose, or Maulana Abul Kalam Azad or I or any other member of the Working Committee can meet you at a suitable opportunity.

But when we meet what are we to discuss? Responsible people with organisations behind them can hardly discuss anything in the air. Some

clarification of the issues, some clear statement of what is wanted and what is objected to, is always desirable, otherwise we may not come to grips with the subject. You will remember the argument about what transpired at Delhi in 1935 between you and Babu Rajendra Prasad. There has even been a difference of opinion about the facts. It would be unfortunate if we repeated this performance and then argued about it later.

It is thus highly desirable for us to define the issues first. This is also necessary as we have always to consult many colleagues in regard to any matter affecting Congress policy. There is surely nothing undesirable or inappropriate about this defining of issues by correspondence. It is the usual method adopted between individuals and organisations. May I therefore beg of you to enlighten me?

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

New Delhi, 3rd March, 1938

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 25th February. I regret to find the same spirit running through of making insinuations and innuendoes

and raising all sorts of matters of trifling character which are not germane to our present subject with which you started, namely, how to find the basis of approach to the most vital and prominent question of Hindu-Muslim unity. You wind up your letter by insisting upon the course that I should formulate the points in dispute and submit to you for your consideration and then carry on correspondence with you. This method, I have already stated in my considered opinion, is undesirable and inappropriate. The method you insist upon may be appropriate between two litigants and that is followed by solicitors on behalf of their clients, but national issues cannot be settled like that.

When you say 'that I am afraid I must confess that I do not know what fundamental points in dispute are' I am only amazed at your ignorance. This matter has been tackled since 1925 right upto 1935 by the most prominent leaders in the country and so far no solution has been found. I would beg of you to study it and do not take up a self-complacent attitude and if you are in earnest I don't think you will find much difficulty in realizing what the main points in dispute are, because they have been constantly mentioned both in the press and public platform even very recently.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

Allahabad, March 8, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of March 3rd. I am afraid our letters to each other repeat themselves. I go on requesting you to tell us what exactly are the points in dispute which have to be discussed and you go on insisting that this should not be done by correspondence. At the same time you have pointed out that the main points in dispute have been constantly, and very recently, discussed in the press and public platform. I have carefully followed press statements and your public speeches. In my effort to discover these points of dispute I enumerated some of the criticisms which you were reported to have made in public speeches. In your reply you stated that you were misreported, but you did not say what the correct report should have been. Further you said that these were minor and trifling matters, but again you did not point out what the major matters were. You will perceive my difficulty. I hope I am not making any insinuations or innuendoes, as you suggest in your last letter. Certainly it is not my intention to do so, nor to raise trifling matters which are not germane to the present subject. But what are these matters which are germane? It may be that I am dense or not sufficiently acquainted with the intricacies of the problem. If so I deserve to be enlightened. If you will refer me to any recent statement made in the press or platform which

will help me in understanding, I shall be grateful.

It is not my desire, may I repeat, to carry on a controversy by correspondence, but only to find out what the main points of discussion and dispute are. It is surely usual for national issues to be formulated and clarified in this way to facilitate discussion. Both in national and international matters we are frequently adopting this course.

You are perfectly right in saying that this matter has been tackled since 1925 repeatedly. Do you not think that this very history warns us not to approach it in a vague manner without clear ideas as to what we object to and what we want? Apart from this, much has happened during these past few years which has altered the position. For instance the Communal Award. Do you want this discussed with a view to some settlement being arrived at on another basis?

It is obvious that the Congress is exceedingly anxious to remove all causes of misunderstanding and friction. Apart from wider national issues, it would like to do so because such misunderstanding comes in the way of its work. It has frequently considered the problem and passed such resolutions and put forward such proposals as it considered right. I do not wish to discuss as to whether these were right or not. That may be a matter for argument. But according to our lights we tried to do our best. If we did not succeed to the extent we hoped to do that is our misfortune and

we shall gladly consider suggestions which might lead to better results.

What are the various aspects of this matter? May I enumerate them?

1. The Communal Award, which includes separate electorates and reservation of seats.
2. Religious guarantees.
3. Cultural protection and guarantees.

Presumably these are the three main heads. There may be some minor matters but I do not refer to them as you wish to concentrate on the main issues.

As regards the Communal Award the position of the Congress has been clarified. If it is your desire to discuss this matter, I should like to know.

As regards religious and cultural guarantees, the Congress has given as full assurances and guarantees as is possible. If however any other guarantees are considered necessary, they should be mentioned. About one of the questions which you have referred to in your speeches, the Language question, I have written to you previously and sent you my brochure. I trust that you agreed with its main conclusions.

Are we going to discuss these matters or some others which I have not mentioned above? Then again the background of all such discussions must necessarily be a certain political and economic one —our struggle for independence, our anti-imperialism, our methods of direct action whenever necessary, our anti-war policy, our attempt to remove the exploitation of the masses, agrarian and labour problems, and the like. I take it that with the re-orientation of the Muslim League's policy there will not be any great difference regarding this anti-imperialist background.

You will forgive me for repeating myself in these letters and for saying the same things over and over again. I do so because I am keenly desirous of your appreciating my viewpoint, which I believe is also the viewpoint of my colleagues in the Congress. I have no desire to take up your time and to spend my time in writing long letters. But my mind demands clarity before it can function effectively or think in terms of any action. Vagueness or an avoidance of real issues cannot lead to satisfactory results. It does seem strange to me that in spite of my repeated requests I am not told what issues have to be discussed.

I understand that Gandhiji has already written to you expressing his readiness to have a talk with you. I am not now the Congress President and thus have not the same representative capacity, but if I can be of any help in this matter my services

are at the disposal of the Congress and I shall gladly meet you and discuss these matters with you.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

From Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Nehru.

New Delhi, 17th March, 1938

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal,

I have received your letter of the 8th of March, 1938. Your first letter of the 18th of January, conveyed to me that you desire to know the points in dispute for the purpose of promoting Hindu-Muslim unity. When in reply I said that the subject-mater cannot be solved through correspondence and it was equally undesirable as discussing matters in the press, you in your reply of the 4th of February, formulated a catalogue of grievances with regard to my supposed criticism of the Congress and utterances which are hardly relevant to the question for our immediate consideration. You went on persisting on the same line and you are still of opinion that those matters, although not germane to the present subject, should be further discussed, which I do not propose to do as I have already explained to you in my previous letter.

The question with which we started, as I understood, is of safeguarding the rights and the interests of the Mussalmans with regard to their religion, culture, language, personal laws and politicial rights in the national life, the government and the administration of the country. Various suggestions have been made which will satisfy the Mussalmans and create a sense of security and confidence in the majority community. I am surprised when you say in your letter under reply, "But what are these matters which are germane. It may be that I am dense or not sufficiently acquainted with the intricacies of the problem. If so, I deserve to be enlightened. If you will refer me to any recent statement made in the press or platform which will help me in understanding, I shall be grateful." Perhaps you have heard of the Fourteen Points.

Next, as you say, "Apart from this much has happened during these past few years which has altered the position." Yes, I agree with you, and various suggestions have appeared in the newspapers recently. For instance, if you will refer to the *Statesman*, dated the 12th of February, 1938, there appears an article under the heading "Through Muslim Eyes" (copy enclosed for your convenience). Next, an article in the *New Times*, dated the 1st of March, 1938, dealing with your pronouncement recently made, I believe, at Haripura sessions of the Congress, where you are reported to have said:

"I have examined this so-called communal question through the telescope, and if there is nothing what can you see."

This article in the *New Times* appeared on the 1st of March, 1938, making numerous suggestions (copy enclosed for your convenience). Further you must have seen Mr. Aney's interview where he warned the Congress mentioning some of the points which the Muslim League would demand.

Now, this is enough to show to you that various suggestions that have been made, or are likely to be made, or are expected to be made, will have to be analysed and ultimately I consider it is the duty of every true nationalist, to whichever party or community he may belong to make it his business and examine the situation and bring about a pact between the Mussalmans and the Hindus and create a real united front; and it should be as much your anxiety and duty as it is mine, irrespective of the question of the party or the community to which we belong. But if you desire that I should collect all these suggestions and submit to you as a petitioner for you and your colleagues to consider, I am afraid I can't do it nor can I do it for the purpose of carrying on further correspondence with regard to those various points with you. But if you still insist upon that, as you seem to do so when you say in your letter, "My mind demands clarity before it can function effectively or think in terms of any action. Vagueness or an avoidance of real issues could not lead to satisfactory results. It does seem strange to me that in spite of my repeated requests I am not told what issues have to be discussed." This is hardly a correct description or a fair representation; but in that case I would request you to ask the Congress

officially to communicate with me to that effect, and I shall place the matter before the Council of the All-India Muslim League; as you yourself say that you are "not the Congress President and thus have not the same representative capacity but if I can be of any help in this matter my services are at the disposal of the Congress and I shall gladly meet you and discuss these matters with you." As to meeting you and discussing matters with you, I need hardly say that I shall be pleased to do so.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Extract from the *Statesman*, New Delhi Edition

12th February, 1938

THROUGH MUSLIM EYES

By Ain-el-Mulk

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's Bombay statement of January 2 on the Hindu-Moslem question has produced hopeful reactions and the stage has been set for a talk between the leaders of what, for the sake of convenience, may be described as Hindu India and Moslem India. Whether the Jinnah-Jawaharlal talks will produce in 1938 better results than the Jinnah-Prasad talks did in 1935 is yet to be seen. Too much optimism would not, however,

be justified. The Pandit, by way of annotating his Bombay statement while addressing the U. P. delegates for Haripura at Lucknow, at the end of January, emphatically asserted that in no case would Congress "give up its principles." That was not a hopeful statement because any acceptable formula or pact that may be evolved by the leaders of the Congress and the League would, one may guess, involve the acquiescence of the Congress in separate electorates (at least for a certain period), coalition ministries, recognition of the League as the one authoritative and representative organization of Indian Moslems, modification of its attitude on the question of Hindi and its script scrapping of Bande Mataram altogether, and possibly a redesigning of the tri-colour flag or at least agreeing to give the flag of the League an equal importance. It is possible that with a little statesmanship on both sides agreement can be reached on all these points without any infringement of the principles of either, but the greatest obstacle to a *satisfactory* solution would still remain,—in the shape of the communalists of the Mahasabha, and the irreconcilables of Bengal, all of whom are not of the Mahasabha alone. The right of the Congress to speak in the name of Hindus has been openly challenged and even the Jinnah-Prasad formula which did not satisfy the Moslems—and nothing on the lines of which is now likely to satisfy them —has been vehemently denounced by the Bengal Provincial Conference held at Vishnupur recently passed no extremely communal resolution, and that the latest utterances of the Congress President-elect on the communal situation generally and the

Jinnah-Prasad formula in particular show some restraint. The only thing for Moslems to do in the circumstances is to wait and hope for the best, without relaxing their efforts to add daily to the strength of the League, for it will not do to forget that it is the growing power and representative character of the Muslim League which has compelled Congress leaders to recognize the necessity for an understanding with the Moslem community.

* * *

Extract from the *New Times*, Lahore,
1st March, 1938

THE COMMUNAL QUESTION

In its last session at Haripura, the Indian National Congress passed a resolution for assuring minorities of their religious and cultural rights. The resolution was moved by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and was carried. The speech which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made on this occasion was as bad as any speech could be. If the resolution has to be judged in the light of that speech, then it comes to this that the resolution has been passed not in any spirit of seriousness, but merely as a meaningless assurance to satisfy the foolish minorities who are clamouring "for the satisfaction of the communal problem." Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru proceeded on the basis that there was really no communal question. We should like to reproduce the trenchant manner in which he put forward the proposition. He said: "I have examined the *so called communal question* through the telescope and, if there is nothing,

what can you see." It appears to us that it is the height of dishonesty to move a resolution with these premises. If there is no minority question, why proceed to pass a resolution? Why not state that there is no minority question. This is not the first time that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has expressed his complete inability to understand or see the communal question. When replying to a statement of Mr. Jinnah, he reiterated his conviction that in spite of his best endeavour to understand what Mr. Jinnah wanted, he could not get at what he wanted. He seems to think that with the Communal Award which the Congress has opposed, the seats in the Legislature have become assured and now nothing remains to be done. He repeats the offensive statement that the Communal Award is merely a problem created by the middle or upper classes for the sake of a few seats in the Legislature or appointments in Government service or for Ministerial positions. We should like to tell Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that he has completely misunderstood the position of the Muslim minority and it is a matter of intense pain that the President of an All India Organisation, which claims to represent the entire population of India, should be so completely ignorant of the demands of the Muslim minority. We shall set forth below some of the demands so that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru may not have any occasion hereafter to say that he does not know what more the Muslims want. The Muslim demands are :—

1. That the Congress shall henceforth withdraw all opposition to the Communal Award and should cease to prate about it as if it were a negation of

nationalism. It may be a negation of nationalism but if the Congress has announced in its statement that it is not opposing the Communal Award, the Muslims want that the Congress should at least stop all agitation for the recession of the Communal Award. 2. The Communal Award merely settles the question of the representation of the Muslims and of other minorities in the Legislatures of the country. The further question of the representation of the minorities in the services of the country remains. Muslims demand that they are as much entitled to be represented in the services of their motherland as the Hindus and since the Muslims have come to realize by their bitter experience that it is impossible for any protection to be extended to Muslim rights in the matter of their representation in the services, it is necessary that the share of the Muslims in the services should be definitely fixed in the constitution and by statutory enactment so that it may not be open to any Hindu head of any department to ride rough shod over Muslim claims in the name of "Efficiency." Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru knows that in the name of efficiency and merit, the rights of Indians to man the services of their country was denied by the bureaucracy. Today when Congress is in power in 7 Provinces, the Muslims have a right to demand the Congress leaders that they shall unequivocally express themselves in this regard. 3. Muslims demand that the protection of their Personal Law and their culture shall be guaranteed by the statute. And as an acid test of the sincerity of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Congress in this regard, Muslims demand that

the Congress should take in hand the agitation in connection with the Shahidganj Mosque and should use its moral pressure to ensure that the Shahidganj Mosque is restored to its original position and that the Sikhs desist from profane uses and thereby injuring the religious susceptibilities of the Muslims. 4. Muslims demand that their right to call Azan and perform religious ceremonies shall not be fettered in any way. We should like to tell Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that in a village, in the Kasur Tehsil, of the Lahore District, known as Raja Jang, the Muslim inhabitants of that place are not allowed by the Sikhs to call out their Azans loudly. With such neighbours it is necessary to have a statutory guarantee that the religious rights of the Muslims shall not be in any way interfered with and on the advent of Congress rule to demand of the Congress that it shall use its powerful organization for the prevention of such an event. In this connection we should like to tell Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that the Muslims claim cow slaughter as one of their religious rights and demand that so long as the Sikhs are permitted to carry on Jhatka and to live on Jhatka, the Muslims have every right to insist on their undoubted right to slaughter cows. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is not a very great believer in religious injunctions. He claims to be living on the economic plane and we should like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to know that for a Muslim the question of cow slaughter is a measure of economic necessity and that therefore does it not open to any Hindu to statutorily prohibit the slaughter of cows.

5. Muslims demand that their majorities in the Provinces in which they are at present shall not be affected by any territorial redistributions or adjustments. The Muslims are at present in majority in the provinces of Bengal, Punjab, Sind, North West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. Let the Congress hold out the guarantee and express its readiness to the incorporation of this guarantee in the Statute that the present distribution of the Muslim population in the various provinces shall not be interfered with through the medium of any territorial distribution or re-adjustment.

6. The question of national anthem is another matter. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru cannot be unaware that Muslims all over have refused to accept the Bande Mataram or any expurgated addition of that anti-Muslim song as a binding national anthem. If Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru cannot succeed in inducing the Hindu majority to drop the use of this song, then let him not talk so tall, and let him realize that the great Hindu mass does not take him seriously except as a strong force to injure the cause of Muslim solidarity.

7. The question of language and script is another demand of the Muslims. The Muslims insist on Urdu being practically their national language; they want statutory guarantees that the use of Urdu tongue shall not in any wiser manner be curtailed or damaged.

8. The question of the representation of the Muslims in the local bodies is another unsolved

question. Muslims demand that the principle underlying, the Communal Award, namely, separate electorates and representation according to population strength should apply uniformly in all the various local and other elected bodies from top to bottom.

We can go on multiplying this list but for the present we should like to know the reply of the Congress and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the demands that we have set forth above. We should like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru fully to understand that the Muslims are more anxious than the Hindus to see complete independence in the real sense of that term established in India. They do not believe in any Muslim Raj for India and will fight a Hindu Raj tooth and nail. They stand for the complete freedom of the country and of all classes inhabiting this country, but they shall oppose the establishment of any majority raj of a kind that will make a clean sweep of the cultural, religious and political guarantees of the various minorities as set forth above. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is under the comforting impression that the question set forth above are trivial questions but he should reconsider his position in the light of the emphasis and importance which the minorities which are affected by the programme of the Congress place on these matters. After all it is the minorities which are to judge and not the majorities. It appears to us that with the attitude of mind which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru betrayed in his speech and which the seconder of that resolution equally exhibited in his speech, namely, that the question of minorities and majori-

ties was an artificial one and created to suit vested interests, it is obvious that nothing can come out of the talks that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru recently initiated between himself and Mr. Jinnah. If the Congress is in the belief that this reiteration of its innane pledge to the minorities will satisfy them and that they will be taken in by mere words, the Congress is badly mistaken.

* * *

From Mr. Nehru to Mr. Jinnah

Calcutta, April 6, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Your letter of the 17th March reached me in the Kumaum Hills where I had gone for a brief holiday. From there I have come to Calcutta. I propose to return to Allahabad today and I shall probably be there for the greater part of April. If it is convenient for you to come there we could meet. Or if it suits you better to go to Lucknow I shall try to go there.

I am glad that you have indicated in your last letter a number of points which you have in mind. The enclosures you have sent mention these and I take it that they represent your viewpoint. I was somewhat surprised to see this list as I had no idea that you wanted to discuss many of these matters with us. Some of these are wholly covered by previous decisions of the Congress, some others are hardly capable of discussion.

As far as I can make out from your letter and the enclosures you have sent, you wish to discuss the following matters :

1. The Fourteen Points formulated by the Muslim League in 1929.

2. The Congress should withdraw all opposition to the Communal Award and should not describe it as a negation of nationalism.

3. The share of the Muslims in the State services should be definitely fixed in the Constitution by statutory enactment.

4. Muslim Personal Law and culture should be guaranteed by Statute.

5. The Congress should take in hand the agitation in connection with the Shahidganj Mosque and should use its moral pressure to enable the Muslims to gain possession of the mosque.

6. The Muslims' right to call Azan and perform religious ceremonies should not be fettered in any way.

7. Muslims should have freedom to perform cow-slaughter.

8. Muslim majorities in the Provinces, where such majorities exist at present, must not be affected by any territorial redistribution or adjustments.

9. The Bande Mataram song should be given up.

10. Muslims want Urdu to be the national language of India and they desire to have statutory guarantees that the use of Urdu shall not be curtailed or damaged.

11. Muslim representation in the local bodies should be governed by the principles underlying the Communal Award, that is separate electorates and population strength.

12. The tri-colour flag should be changed or, alternatively, the flag of the Muslim League should be given equal importance.

13. Recognition of the Muslim League as the one authoritative and representative organization of Indian Muslims.

14. Coalition ministries.

It is further stated that the formula evolved by you and Babu Rajendra Prasad in 1935 does not satisfy the Muslims now and nothing on those lines will satisfy them.

It is added that the list given above is not a complete list and that it can be augmented by the addition of further 'demands.' Not knowing these possible and unlimited additions I can say nothing about them. But I should like to deal with the various matters specifically mentioned and to in-

dicate what the Congress attitude has been in regard to them.

But before considering them, the political and economic background of the free India we are working for has to be kept in mind, for ultimately that is the controlling factor. Some of these matters do not arise in considering an independent India or take a particular shape or have little importance. We can discuss them in terms of Indian independence or in terms of the British dominance of India continuing. The Congress naturally thinks in terms of independence, though it adjusts itself occasionally to the pressure of transitional and temporary phases. It is thus not interested in amendments to the present constitution, but aims at its removal and its substitution by a constitution framed by the people through a Constituent Assembly.

Another matter has assumed an urgent and vital significance and this is the exceedingly critical international situation and the possibility of war. This must concern India greatly and affect her struggle for freedom. This must therefore be considered the governing factor of the situation and almost everything else becomes of secondary importance, for all our efforts and petty arguments will be of little avail if the very foundation is upset. The Congress has clearly and repeatedly laid down its policy in the event of such a crisis and stated that it will be no party to imperialist war. The Congress will very gladly and willingly co-operate

with the Muslim League and all other organizations and individuals in the furtherance of this policy.

I have carefully looked through the various matters to which you have drawn attention in your letter and its enclosures and I find that there is nothing in them which refers to or touches the economic demands of the masses or affects the all-important questions of poverty and unemployment. For all of us in India these are the vital issues and unless some solution is found for them, we function in vain. The question of State services, howsoever important and worthy of consideration it might be, affects a very small number of people. The peasantry, industrial workers, artisans and petty shop-keepers form the vast majority of the population and they are not improved in any way by any of the demands listed above. Their interests should be paramount.

Many of the 'demands' involve changes of the constitution which we are not in a position to bring about. Even if some such changes are desirable in themselves, it is not our policy to press for minor constitutional changes. We want to do away completely with the present constitution and replace it by another for a free India.

In the same way the desire for statutory guarantees involves constitutional changes which we cannot give effect to. All we can do is to state that in a future constitution for a free India we want certain guarantees to be incorporated. We have done this in regard to religious, cultural, linguistic

and other rights of minorities in the Karachi resolution on Fundamental Rights. We would like these fundamental rights to be made a part of the constitution.

I now deal with the various matters listed above.

1. The Fourteen Points, I had thought, were some-what out of date. Many of their provisions have been given effect to by the Communal Award and in other ways, some others are entirely acceptable to the Congress; yet others require constitutional changes which, as I have mentioned above, are beyond our present competence. Apart from the matters covered by the Communal Award and those involving a change in the constitution, one or two matters remain which give rise to differences of opinion and which are still likely to lead to considerable argument.

2. The Congress has clearly stated its attitude towards the Communal Award, and it comes to this that it seeks alterations only on the basis of mutual consent of the parties concerned. I do not understand how any one can take objection to this attitude and policy. If we are asked to describe the Award as not being anti-national, that would be patently false. Even apart from what it gives to various groups, its whole basis and structure are anti-national and come in the way of the development of national unity. As you know it gives an overwhelming and wholly undeserving weightage to the European elements in

certain parts of India. If we think in terms of an independent India, we cannot possibly fit in this Award with it. It is true that under stress of circumstances we have sometimes to accept as a temporary measure some thing that is on the face of it anti-national. It is also true that in the matters governed by the Communal Award we can only find a satisfactory and abiding solution by the consent and good-will of the parties concerned. That is the Congress policy.

3. The fixing of the Muslims' share in the State services by statutory enactment necessarily involves the fixing of the shares of other groups and communities similarly. This would mean a rigid and compartmental State structure which will impede progress and development. At the same time it is generally admitted that State appointments should be fairly and adequately distributed and no community should have cause to complain. It is far better to do this by convention and agreement. The Congress is fully alive to this issue and desires to meet the wishes of various groups in the fullest measure so as to give to all minority communities, as stated in No. 11 of the Fourteen Points, "an adequate share in all the services of the State and in local self-governing bodies having due regard to the requirements of efficiency." The State today is becoming more and more technical and demands expert knowledge in its various departments. It is right that, if a community is backward in this technical and expert knowledge, special efforts should be made to give it this education to bring it up to a higher level.

I understand that at the Unity Conference held at Allahabad in 1933 or thereabouts, a mutually satisfactory solution of this question of State services was arrived at.

4. As regards protection of culture the Congress has declared its willingness to embody this in the fundamental laws of the constitution. It has also declared that it does not wish to interfere in any way with the personal law of any community.

5. I am considerably surprised at the suggestions that the Congress should take in hand the agitation in connection with the Shahidgunj mosque. That is a matter to be decided either legally or by mutual agreement. The Congress prefers in all such matters the way of mutual agreement and its services can always be utilised for this purpose where there is no opening for them and a desire to this effect on the part of the parties concerned. I am glad that the Premier of the Punjab has suggested that this is the only satisfactory way to a solution of the problem.

6. The right to perform religious ceremonies should certainly be guaranteed to all communities. The Congress resolution about this is quite clear. I know nothing about the particular incident relating to a Punjab village which has been referred to. No doubt many instances can be gathered together from various parts of India where petty interferences take place with Hindu, Muslim or Sikh ceremonies. These have to be tactfully dealt with wherever

they arise. But the principle is quite clear and should be agreed to.

7. As regards cow-slaughter there has been a great deal or entirely false and unfounded propaganda against the Congress suggesting that the Congress was going to stop it forcibly by legislation. The Congress does not wish to undertake any legislative action in this matter to restrict the established rights of the Muslims.

8. The question of territorial distribution has not arisen in any way. If any when it arises it must be dealt with on the basis of mutual agreement of the parties concerned.

9. Regarding the Bande Mataram song the Working Committee issued a long statement in October last to which I would invite your attention. First of all, it has to be remembered that no formal national anthem has been adopted by the Congress at any time. It is true, however, that the Bande Mataram song has been intimately associated with Indian nationalism for more than thirty years and numerous associations of sentiment and sacrifice have gathered round it. Popular songs are not made to order, nor can they be successfully imposed. They grow out of public sentiment. During all these thirty or more years the Bande Mataram song was never considered as having any religious significance and was treated as a national song in praise of India. Nor, to my knowledge, was any objection taken to it except on political grounds

by the Government. When however some objectoins were raised, the Working Committee carefully considered the matter and ultimately decided to recommend that certain stanzas, which contained certain allegorical references, might not be used on national platforms or occasions. The two stanzas that have been recommended by the Working Committee for use as a national song have not a word or a phrase which can offend anybody from any point of view and I am surprised that any one can object to them. They may appeal to some more than to others. Some may prefer another national song. But to compel large numbers of people to give up what they have long valued and grown attached to is to cause needless hurt to them and injure the national movement itself. It would be improper for a national organisation to do this.

10. About Urdu and Hindi I have previously written to you and have also sent you my pamphlet on "The question of language." The Congress has declared in favour of guarantes for languages and culture. I want to encourage all the great provincial languages of India and at the same time to make Hindustani, as written both in *nagri* and Urdu scripts, the national language. Both scripts should be officially recognised and the choice should be left to the people concerned. In fact this policy is being pursued by the Congress Ministries.

11. The Congress has long been of opinion that joint electorates are preferable to separate electorates from the point of view of national

unity and harmonious co-operation between the different communities. But joint electorates, in order to have real value, must not be imposed on unwilling groups. Hence the Congress is quite clear that their introduction should depend on their acceptance by the people concerned. This is the policy that is being pursued by the Congress Ministries in regard to Local bodies. Recently in a bill dealing with local bodies introduced in the Bombay Assembly, separate electorates were maintained but an option was given to the people concerned to adopt a joint electorate, if they so chose. This principle seems to be in exact accordance with No. 5 of the Fourteen Points, which lays down that "Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorate as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate." It surprises me that the Muslim League group in the Bombay Assembly should have opposed the Bill with its optional clause although this carried out the very policy of the Muslim League.

May I also point out that in the resolution passed by the Muslim League in 1929, at the time it adopted the Fourteen Points, it was stated that "the Mussalmans will not consent to joint electorates unless Sind is actually constituted into a separate province and reforms in fact are introduced in the N. W. F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces." Since then Sind has been separated and the N.W.F. Province has been placed on a level with other provinces.

So far as Baluchistan is concerned the Congress is committed to a levelling up of this area in the same way.

12. The national tri-colour flag was adopted originally in 1929 by the Congress after full and careful consultation with eminent Muslim, Sikh and other leaders. Obviously a country and national movement must have a national flag representing the nation and all communities in it. No communal flag can represent the nation. If we did not possess a national flag now we would have to evolve one. The present National Flag had its colours originally selected in order to represent the various communities, but we did not like to lay stress on this communal aspect of colours. Artistically I think the combination of orange, white and green has resulted in a flag which is probably the most beautiful of all national flags. For these many years our flag has been used and it has spread to the remotest village and brought hope and courage and a sense of all India unity to our masses. It has been associated with great sacrifices on the part of our people, including Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs, and many have suffered lathi blows and imprisonment and even death in defending it from insult or injury. Thus a powerful sentiment has grown up in its favour. On innumerable occasions Maulana Mohamed Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali and many leaders of the Muslim League today have associated themselves with this flag and emphasised its virtues and significance as a symbol of Indian unity. It has spread outside the Congress ranks and been generally recognised as the flag

of the nation. It is difficult to understand how any one can reasonably object to it now.

Communal flags cannot obviously take its place for that can only mean a host of flags of various communities being used together and thus emphasising our disunity and separateness. Communal flags might be used for religious functions but they have no place at any national functions or over any public building meant for various communities.

May I add that during the past few months, on several occasions, the National Flag has been insulted by some members of volunteers of the Muslim League. This has pained us greatly but we have deliberately avoided anything in the nature of conflict in order not to add to communal bitterness. We have also issued strict orders, and they have been obeyed, that no interference should take place with the Muslim League Flag, even though it might be inappropriately displayed.

13. I do not understand what is meant by our recognition of the Muslim League as the one and only organisation of Indian Muslims. Obviously the Muslim League is an important communal organisation and we deal with it as such. But we have to deal with all organisations and individuals that come within our ken. We do not determine the measure of importance or distinction they possess. There are a large number, about a hundred thousand, of Muslims on the Congress rolls, many of whom have been our close companions, in prisons and outside, for many years and we value

their comradeship highly. There are many organisations which contain Muslims and non-Muslims alike, such as Trade Unions, Peasant Unions, Kisan Sabhas, Debt Committees, Zamindar Associations, Chambers of Commerce, Employers' Association, etc., and we have contacts with them. There are special Muslim organisations such as the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the Proja Party, the Ahrars and others, which claim attention. Inevitably the more important the organisation the more the attention paid to it, but this importance does not come from outside recognition but from inherent strength. And the other organisations, even though they might be younger and smaller, cannot be ignored.

14. I should like to know what is meant by coalition ministries. A ministry must have a definite political and economic programme and policy. And other kind of ministry would be a disjointed and ineffective body, with no clear mind or direction. Given a common political and economic programme and policy, co-operation is easy. You know probably that some such co-operation was sought for and obtained by the Congress in the Frontier Province. In Bombay also repeated attempts were made on behalf of the Congress to obtain this co-operation on the basis of a common programme. The Congress has gone to the Assemblies with a definite programme and in furtherance of clear policy. It will always gladly co-operate with other groups, whether it is in a majority or a minority in an Assembly, in furtherance of that programme and policy. On that basis I conceive of even coalition ministries

being formed. Without that basis the Congress has no interest in Ministry or in an Assembly.

I have dealt, I am afraid at exceeding length, with the various points raised in your letter and its enclosures. I am glad that I have had a glimpse into your mind through this correspondence as this enables me to understand a little better the problems that are before you and perhaps others. I agree entirely that it is the duty of every Indian to bring about harmonious joint effort of all of us for the achievement of India's freedom and the ending of the poverty of her people. For me, and I take it for most of us, the Congress has been a means to that end and not an end in itself. It has been a high privilege for us to work through the Congress because it has drawn to itself the love of millions of our countrymen, and through their sacrifice and united effort, taken us a long way to our goal. But much remains to be done and we have all to pull together to that end.

Personally the idea of pacts and the like does not appeal to me, though perhaps they might be necessary occasionally. What seems to me far more important is a more basic understanding of each other, bringing with it the desire and ability to co-operate together. That larger co-operation, if it is to include our millions must necessarily be in the interests of these millions. My mind therefore is continually occupied with the problems of these unhappy masses of this country and I view all other problems in this light. I should live to

view the communal problem also in this perspective for otherwise it has no great significance for me.

You seem to imagine that I wanted you to put forward suggestions as a petitioner, and then you propose that the Congress should officially communicate with you. Surely you have misunderstood me and done yourself and me an injustice. There is no question of petitioning either by you or by me, but a desire to understand each other and the problem that we have been discussing. I do not understand the significance of your wanting an official intimation from the Congress. I did not ask you for an official reply on behalf of the Muslim League. Organisations do not function in this way. It is not a question of prestige for the Congress or for any of us, for we are keener on reaching the goal we have set before us, than on small matters of prestige. The Congress is a great enough organisation to ignore such petty matters, and if some of us have gained a measure of influence and popularity, we have done so in the shadow of Congress.

You will remember that I took the initiative in writing to you and requesting you to enlighten me as to what your objections were to the Congress policy and what, according to you, were the points in dispute. I had read many of your speeches, as reported in the press, and I found to my regret that they were full of strong attacks on the Congress which, according to my way of thinking, were not justified. I wanted to remove any misunderstandings, where such existed, and to clear the air.

I have found, chiefly in the Urdu press, the most astounding falsehoods about the Congress. I refer to facts, not to opinions, and to facts within my knowledge. Two days ago, here in Calcutta, I saw a circular letter or notice issued by a secretary of a Muslim League. This contained a list of the so-called misdeeds of the U.P. Government. I read this with amazement for there was not an item of truth in most of the charges. I suppose they were garnered from the Urdu press. Through the press and the platform such charges have been repeated on numerous occasions and communal passions have thus been roused and bitterness created. This has grieved me and I have sought by writing to you and to Nawab Ismail Khan to find a way of checking this deplorable deterioration of our public life, as well as a surer basis for co-operation. That problem still faces us and I hope we shall solve it.

I have mentioned earlier in this letter the critical international situation and the terrible sense of impending catastrophe that hangs over the world. My mind is obsessed with this and I want India to realise it and be ready for all consequences, good or ill, that may flow from it. In this period of world crisis all of us, to whatever party or group we might belong and whatever our differences might be, have the primary duty of holding together to protect our people from perils that might encompass them. Our differences and arguments seem trivial when the future of the world and of India hangs in the balance. It is in the hope that all of us will succeed in building up this larger unity in

our country that I have written to you and others repeatedly and at length.

There is one small matter I should like to mention. The report of any speech at Haripura, as given in your letter and the newspaper article, is not correct.

We have been corresponding for some time and many vague rumours float about as to what we have been saying to each other. Anxious inquiries come to me and I have no doubt that similar inquiries are addresed to you also. I think that we might take the public into our confidence now for this is a public matter on which many are interested. I suggest, therefore, that our correspondence might be released to the press. I presume you will have no objection.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

Bombay, April 12, 1938

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th April, 1938. I am extremely obliged to you for informing me that you propose to return to Allahabad

and shall probably be there for the greater part of April and suggesting that, if it would be convenient for me to come there, we could meet, or, if it suits me better to go to Lucknow, you will try to go there. I am afraid that it is not possible for me owing to my other engagements, but I shall be in Bombay about the end of April and if it is convenient to you, I shall be very glad to meet you.

As to the rest of your letter, it has been to me a most painful reading. It seems to me that you cannot even accurately interpret my letter, as you very honestly say that "your mind is obsessed with the International situation and the terrible sense of impending catastrophe that hangs over the world", so you are thinking in terms entirely divorced from realities which face us in India. I can only express my great regret at your turning and twisting what I wrote to you and putting entirely a wrong complexion upon the position I have placed before you at your request. You have formulated certain points in your letter which you father upon me to begin with as my proposals. I sent you extracts from the press which had recently appeared simply because I believed you when you repeatedly asserted and appealed to me that you would be grateful if I would refer you to any recent statements made in the press or platform which would help you in understanding matters. Those are some of the matters which are undoubtedly agitating Muslim India, but the question how to meet them and to what extent and by what means and methods, is the business, as I have said before, of every true nationalist to solve. Whether consti-

tutional changes are necessary, whether we should do it by agreement or conventions and so forth, are matters, I thought, were for discussion, but I am extremely sorry to find that you have in your letter already pronounced your judgment and given your decisions on a good many of them with a preamble which negatives any suggestion of discussion which may lead to a settlement, as you start by saying "I was so much surprised to see this list as I have no idea that you wanted to discuss many of these matters with us; some of these are wholly covered by previous decisions of the Congress, some others are hardly capable of discussion," and then you proceed to your conclusions having formulated the points according to your own notions. Your tone and language again display the same arrogance and militant spirit as if the Congress is the sovereign power and, as an indication, you extend your patronage by saying that "obviously the Muslim League is an important communal organisation and we deal with it as such, as we have to deal with all organisations and individuals that come within our ken. We do not determine the measure of importance or distinction they possess" and then you mention various other organisations. Here I may add that in my opinion, as I have publicly stated so often, that unless the Congress recognises the Muslim League on a footing of complete equality and is prepared as such to negotiate for a Hindu-Muslim settlement, we shall have to wait and depend upon our inherent strength which will "determine the measure of importance or distinction it possesses." Having regard to your mentality it is really difficult for me

to make you understand the position any further. Of course, as I have said before, I do not propose to discuss the various matters, referred to by you, by means of and through correspondence, as, in my opinion, that is not the way to tackle this matter.

With regard to your reference to certain falsehoods that have appeared about the Congress in the Urdu press, which, you say, have astounded you, and with regard to the circular letter referred to about the misdeeds of the U.P. Government, I can express no opinion without investigation, but I can give you number of falsehoods that have appeared in the Congress press and in statements of Congressmen with regard to the All-India Muslim League, some of the leaders and those who are connected with it. Similarly I can give instances of reports appearing in the Congress press and speeches of Congressmen which are daily deliberately misrepresenting and vilifying the Muslim composition of the Bengal, Sind, Punjab, and Assam Governments with a view to break those Governments, but that is not the subject matter of our correspondence and besides no useful purpose will be served in doing so.

With regard to your request that our correspondence should be released to the press, I have no objection provided the correspondence between me and Mr. Gandhi is also published simultaneously, as we both have referred to him and his correspondence with me in ours. You will please therefore obtain the permission of Mr. Gandhi to that effect or, if you wish, I will write to him, informing him

that you desire to release the correspondence between us to the press and I am willing to agree to it provided he agrees that the correspondence between him and myself is also released.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Allahabad, April 16, 1938

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Your letter of April 12th has just reached me.

I am exceedingly sorry that anything that I have written to you should have caused you pain. It seems to be true that we approach public problem from different standpoints and inevitably I try to place my viewpoint before you and seek to gain your appreciation of it. To say anything that might pain you would defeat my own purpose, even apart from its impropriety. At the same time I owe it to you and to myself to endeavour to place frankly before you how my mind works and what my views are on the subject matter under discussion. Our viewpoints might differ, but I do believe that the margin of difference can be lessened by a frank approach on either side. I have sought to make this approach in all sincerity and with every desire on my part not to say anything that might come in the way.

In my last letter I dealt with the various points mentioned in the extracts you had sent me as I presumed that, as you had drawn my attention to them, they might to a large extent represent what you had in mind. As you know I have been trying to get at these points of difference and when I saw something concrete I wanted to give my reaction to it. I tried to state what the Congress opinion has been in regard to them. There is no finality in day to day politics, although certain principles are supposed to govern policies. It is for the Congress, if it so chooses, to vary any policy. All I can do is to state what the past and present policy is.

I regret that you think that I write in an arrogant and militant spirit and as if I considered the Congress as the sovereign power. I am painfully conscious of the fact that the Congress is not a sovereign power and that it is circumscribed in a hundred ways and further that it may have to go through the wilderness many a time again before it achieves its objective. You have referred to my obsession with the international situation and the sense of impending catastrophe that possesses me. If I feel that way, as I do, I can hardly grow complacent or imagine that the Congress is sovereign. But when I discuss Congress policies, as a Congressman I can only repeat what these are and not bring in my own particular view on the subject, if these happen to be at variance with Congress resolutions.

You point out to me that the Congress press has contained numerous falsehoods in regard to the Muslim League and some of its leaders, as well

as the provincial governments of Bengal, Punjab, Sind and Assam. I entirely agree with you that falsehoods, misrepresentations and insinuations are to be deprecated and countered wherever they might occur, in the Urdu, Hindi or English press, or whatever the political complexion of the newspaper. There is no such thing as the Congress press over which the Congress has control, but it is true that many newspapers generally support the Congress. But whether we can influence them or not, we certainly want to stop all such false and misleading statements and to express our disapproval of them. In this matter I can only beg to you to point out specific instances so that we might take necessary action.

I note that you say about the publication of our correspondence. I have not got with me copies of your correspondence with Mahatma Gandhi. I am therefore writing to him to seek his permission as suggested by you.

I am afraid it will hardly be possible for me to visit Bombay in April or May. Early in June I intend sailing for Europe. In case I go to Bombay earlier I shall inform you so that we might have the opportunity of meeting. I understand that you will be meeting Mahatma Gandhi in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

PRESS STATEMENT

Press statement issued from Bombay on January 7, 1940, by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League while releasing the correspondence between him and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru:

"I regret to find that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, during his recent tour in the Punjab and elsewhere, has thought fit to attack me in a manner unworthy of any responsible leader. He accuses me of being bent upon the preservation of British domination over India which I can only characterise as not only unwarranted, but mean. The reasons for his refusing to continue his talks with me, as given by him, far from correct, are misleading and unfair.

I would not further comment upon his reckless and irresponsible pronouncements, but I shall rest content with releasing the correspondence between us on the subject. This will show the true reasons for his refusing to proceed further in the matter, and I leave it to the public to judge the impossible attitude that is being taken up by him and the Congress."

* * *

Letter from Mr. Nehru

Allahabad, December 1, 1939

My dear Jinnah,

When we met last in Delhi, it was agreed that

we should meet again to discuss various aspects of the communal problem. You told me that on your return to Bombay you would write to me suggesting some date for such a meeting. I have been looking forward to your letter since then. I hope that whenever it is convenient for you to fix date you will kindly let me know.

Sir Stafford Cripps is coming to India soon and is likely to spend two or three weeks in this country. He is on his way to China. I do not yet exactly know when he will reach here, but probably he will come in about a week's time. During his brief stay in India he would like to meet you if that is possible. I do not know his programme at all, nor do I know what cities he intends visiting. But I take it that he will go to Bombay. Could you kindly let me know if you are likely to be in Bombay about the third week of this month or later? This information might help him to arrange his programme. He is coming by air and will land in Allahabad.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

Bombay, 4th December 1939

My dear Jawahar,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st Decem-

ber, and thank you for it. As at present advised I hope to be in Bombay for the next two or three weeks, and if it is convenient to you I shall be very glad to see you and fix up any date that may suit you. Please, therefore, let me know what date and time will suit you.

As regards Sir Stafford Cripps, I received a letter from him, and I have already replied to him c/o your address as directed by him, and as I have already stated I shall be here in Bombay and as he is arriving at Allahabad on the 8th, as I understand from his letter, I shall be very glad to see him when he is in Bombay. On hearing from him I shall fix up also the date and time that may suit him.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Allahabad, December 9, 1939

My Dear Jinnah,

Two days ago I sent you a letter informing you that I intended going to Bombay soon and hoped to meet you there. Yesterday morning I read in the newspapers your statement fixing December

22nd as a day of deliverance and thanksgiving as a mark of relief that the Congress Governments have at last ceased to function. I have read this statement very carefully more than once and have given twenty-four hours thought to the matter. It is not for me, in this letter, to enter into any controversy about facts or impressions or conclusions. You know my views about these, formed, I hope, in all earnestness and with all desire to find the truth. It may be that I am mistaken, but I have sought more light and that light has not come.

But what has oppressed me terribly since yesterday is the realisation that our sense of values and objectives in life and politics differs so very greatly. I had hoped, after our conversations, that this was not so great, but now the gulf appears to be wider than ever. Under these circumstances, I wonder what purpose will be served by our discussing with each other the problems that confront us. There must be some common ground for discussion, some common objective aimed at, for that discussion to yield fruit. I think, I owe it to you as well as to myself to put this difficulty before you.

You were good enough to show me in Delhi a letter you had received from Bijnor. I enquired into the matter and am informed that the version of facts given to you is not correct and is wholly misleading. If you would care to have an explanation of what happened, I could obtain it for you from Bijnor. For this purpose, I would

like to have a copy of the letter you showed me in Delhi.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

Bombay, 13th December 1939

Dear Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 19th December. I did not know where to address my reply to you as your movements were reported in the press to be uncertain. The latest announcement is that you are arriving in Bombay on the 14th of December and I am therefore sending this letter to your Bombay address. I quite agree with you that "there must be some common ground for discussion, some common objective aimed at for that discussion to yield fruit"; that is the very reason why I made it clear in our conversations at Delhi in October last to Mr. Gandhi and yourself. First, that so long as the Congress is not prepared to treat the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India, it was not possible to carry on talks regarding the Hindu-Muslim settlement as that was the basis laid down by the working committee of the

All-India Muslim League, and second, that we cannot endorse the Congress demand for the declaration as laid down in the resolution of the Working Committee confirmed by the All-India Congress Committee of 10th October 1939, apart from the nebulous and impracticable character of it, till we reach an agreement with regard to the minority problem. The Muslim League was also not satisfied with the declaration made by the Viceroy. If happily we could settle the Hindu-Muslim question, then we would be in a position to evolve an agreed formula for a demand of declaration by His Majesty's Government that would satisfy us; neither the first nor the second suggestion of mine was acceptable to Mr. Gandhi or to yourself at Delhi, but you were good enough to express your wish that you would like to meet me again and I said that I would be always glad to see you. In reply to your letter of the 1st December expressing your wish to see me in Bombay, I informed you that I shall be in Bombay till the 3rd week of December and I shall be glad to see you, and I can only say that if you desire to discuss the matter further I am at your disposal.

As regards your reference to the Bijnor incident I am sure that you will agree with me that it requires a thorough judicial examination and enquiry before any conclusion can be arrived at, and it is hardly worth our while to deal with one instance, for in my judgment the whole working of the constitution and our charges against the Congress

Government must be thoroughly examined by a Royal Commission.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

To
Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru
c/o Mr. Hathi Singh,

Sakina Mansion, Carmichael Road,
BOMBAY.

Carmichael Road,

Bombay, December 14, 1939

My dear Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of the 13th December which was delivered to me in the forenoon today on my arrival here. I sent you my last letter from Allahabad after reading and giving full thought to your statement about the celebration of "a day of deliverance and thanksgiving" by the Muslims. This statement had distressed me greatly as it made me realise that the gulf that separated us in our approach to public problems was very great. In view of this fundamental difference, I wondered

what common ground there was for discussion and I put my difficulty before you. That difficulty remains.

In your letter you have emphasized two other preliminary conditions before any common ground for discussion can arise. The first is that the Congress must treat the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India. The Congress has always considered the League as a very important and influential organisation of the Muslims and it is because of this that we have been eager to settle any differences that may exist between us. But presumably what you suggest is something more and involves some kind of repudiation by us or dissociation from other Muslims who are not in the League, who have been and are our closest colleagues. There are, as you know, a large number of Muslims in the Congress, who have been and are our closest colleagues. There are Muslim organisations like the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the All-India Shia Conference, the Majlis-e-Ahrar, the All-India Momin Conference, etc., apart from trade unions and peasant unions which have many Muslims as their members. As a general rule, many of these organisations and individuals have adopted the same political platform as we have done in the Congress. We cannot possibly dissociate ourselves from them or disown them in any way.

You have rightly pointed out on many occasions that the Congress does not represent every body in India. Of course not. It does not re-

present those who disagree with it, whether they are Muslims or Hindus. In the ultimate analysis it represents its members and sympathisers. So also the Muslim League, as any other organisation, represents its own members and sympathisers. But there is this vital difference that while the Congress constitutionally has its membership open to all who subscribe to its objective and methods, the Muslim League is only open to Muslims. Thus the Congress constitutionally has a national basis and it cannot give that up without putting an end to its existence. There are many Hindus, as you know, in the Hindu Mahasabha who oppose the idea of the Congress representing the Hindus as such. Then there are the Sikhs and others who claim that they should be heard when communal matters are considered.

I am afraid therefore that if your desire is that we should consider the League as the sole organisation representing the Muslims to the exclusion of all others, we are wholly unable to accede to it. It would be equally at variance with facts if we made a similar claim for the Congress, in spite of the vastness of the Congress organisation. But I would venture to say that such questions do not arise when two organisations deal with each other and consider problems of mutual interest.

Your second point is that the Muslim League cannot endorse the Congress demand for a declaration from the British Government. I regret to learn this for this means that, apart from communal questions, we differ entirely on purely political

grounds. The Congress demand is essentially for a declaration of war aims and more especially for a declaration of Indian independence and the right of the Indian people to frame their own constitution without *external interference*. If the Muslim League does not agree to this, this means that our political objectives are wholly dissimilar. The Congress demand is not new. It is inherent in article one of the Congress and all our policy for many years *past has been based on it*. It is inconceivable to me *how the Congress can give it up or even vary it. Personally I would be entirely opposed to any attempt at* variation. But this is not a personal matter. There is a resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, endorsed by a thousand meetings *all over India, and I am powerless to ignore it.*

It thus seems that politically we have no common ground and that our objectives are different. That in itself makes discussion difficult and fruitless. What led me to write my last letter to you also remains the prospect of a celebration of a day of deliverance by the Muslims as suggested by you. That raises very vital and far-reaching issues, in which I need not go now, but which must influence all of us. That approach to the communal problem cannot be reconciled with an attempt to solve it.

I feel, therefore, that it will serve little purpose for us to meet at this stage and under these conditions with this background. I should like to assure you however that we are always prepared to have free and frank discussions of the com-

munal or ther problems as between the Congress and the League.

I note what you say about the Bijnor incident. It has been our misfortune that charges are made in a one-sided way and they are never inquired into or disposed of. You will appreciate that it is very easy to make complaints and very unsafe to rely upon them without due inquiry.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

* * *

Bombay, December 15, 1939

Dear Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th December 1939 and I am sorry to say that you have not appreciated my position with regard to the second point. I did not say that Muslim League cannot endorse the Congress demand for a declaration from British Government. What I have said was that we cannot endorse the Congress

demand for the declaration *as laid down in the resolution of the working committee and confirmed by the All-India Congress Committee of the 10th October 1939 for the reasons I have already specified in my letter.*

If this resolution of the Congress cannot be modified in any way and as you say that personally you would be entirely opposed to any attempt at variation of it and as you make it clear that you are wholly unable to treat with the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India, may I know in these circumstances what do you expect or wish me to do.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Bombay, December 16, 1939

My Dear Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of December 15th.

I realise the difference you have pointed out. Of course the Muslim League cannot oppose the idea of any declaration. What the Congress had asked for was an enunciation of war aims

and a recognition of India's independence and the right of her people to frame their constitution, a right that must necessarily be inherent in independence. All these are basic principles which flow from our objective of independence, and as the Muslim League has the same declared objective, there should be no difference of opinion about them. In the application of these principles many important matters will no doubt have to be considered. But so far as the basic demands are concerned, they are of the very essence of Indian nationalism. To give them up or to vary them materially is to knock down our case for independence.

In regard to the war also the Congress has repeatedly declared its policy during the last eleven years. The present declaration is a logical outcome of that policy. I have personally had some share in shaping this policy and I have attached importance to it. You will appreciate that it is exceedingly difficult, apart from the question of desirability, to vary such long-established and fundamental policies. These policies are political in their essence and, I would venture to say, are the only policies which flow from a demand for Indian freedom. Details may be considered and discussed, their application should be worked out in mutual co-operation and, in particular, the interests of various groups and minorities should be considered carefully and protected. But to challenge the very basis of that declaration is to demonstrate that there is a great difference in political outlook and policies. This, as such, has nothing to do with the Hindu-Muslim problem.

It is because of this that I feel that there is little in common in our political objectives.

May I say again that no one on our behalf, so far as I know, challenges or minimises the authority, influence and importance of the Muslim League. It is for this reason that we have been eager to discuss matters with it and to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problems that confront us. Unfortunately we never seem to reach even the proper discussion of these problems as various hurdles and obstructions, in the shape of conditions precedent, come in our way. These conditions precedent, as I have ventured to point out to you, have *far-reaching significance*. I do not know why they should be allowed to obstruct all progress or prevent us from considering these problems. It should not be difficult to remove these hurdles and come to grips with the subject itself. But as these hurdles continue and others are added to them, I am compelled to think that the real difficulty is the difference in political outlook and objectives.

At the present moment, the decision to have an all India demonstration on December 22nd has added a psychological barrier which effectively prevents mutual approach and discussion. I regret this exceedingly and have earnestly wished that you would see your way to remove this barrier which is leading and can only lead to ill-will. I still hope that you may be able to do so.

I do wish to assure you that for my part I do not want to leave any stone unturned which can

lead to mutual understanding and settlement. But you will not have me, as I do not want to have you, leave integrity of mind and purpose in pursuit of anything. Nothing worthwhile can be gained that way. I have deep political convictions and I have laboured in accordance with them these many years. I cannot leave them at any time, much less now when the world is in the throes of a terrific crisis.

Yours sincerely,

Jawaharlal Nehru

—o—

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

Press statement issued by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League while releasing the correspondence between him and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Nandi Hills, May 1, 1941.

"Let me at once deal with at least one point in the personal statement of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru published on the 29th of April 1941 with regard to his efforts to what he calls 'bringing Mr. Gandhi and me together.' Here is the correspondence that passed between me and Sir Sapru and it speaks for itself. His promise to communicate with me further made in his letter, dated the 19th of February 1941 remained unfulfilled. Having taken the initiative, he had not the courtesy to inform me as to the result of his efforts and as to the causes and reasons of his failure and it is hardly fair that he should now pontifically pronounce in his statement that he does not wish to apportion blame between the leaders and yet in another place in his statement he characterises me as 'an intractable leader', when by my letter, dated the 10th of February 1941, I at once showed my willingness as suggested by him to meet Mr. Gandhi or any other Hindu leader to have a 'heart to heart conversation.'

As regards other matters and points raised in Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's personal statement and

in the statement of the so-called Standing Committee of the Sapru Conference, I shall, if necessary, deal with them later when I have had sufficient time to examine them carefully.

* * *

Letter from Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to Mr. Jinnah

Allahabad, 6th February, 1941

My dear Jinnah,

Since we met last in Bombay a few months ago, I have several times thought of writing to you, but I have never been able, up to this moment, to make up my mind. Even now when I have decided to write to you, I am writing this letter with considerable hesitation, as, if I cannot make things better than they are at present, I certainly do not, in all conscience, want to make them worse. But I believe that since 1916 when we came together in the old India Legislative Council, you have known my views on the Hindu-Mahomedan question, and I am, therefore, venturing to hope that you will not misunderstand my point of view.

Although, I have not been taking active part in politics of the country for the last few years, the old interest still survives, and I follow fairly closely the trend of events. The trend of recent events has only tended to confirm me in my belief that the supreme necessity of the hour is a settlement between the Hindus and the Muslims, or to put it in party politics, between the Congress and

the Hindu Sabha and the Muslim League. It is my misfortune that owing to some very strong convictions, I have found it impossible to join either of the first two and for obvious reasons I could not be a member of the League of which you are the President, and yet I feel that so long as the three big organised bodies of public opinion in India remain in their present state of relationship to each other, the future of this country cannot be by any means bright. It is not my purpose to discuss in this letter which of these three parties is to blame. I think that a discussion of this character can never lead to any good; indeed, I think, instead of doing good, it may do positive harm. You will remember that even in August last when we met at Bombay, I told you that if the Congress and the Hindu Sabha would not, or were not prepared to call a conference for the purpose of settling differences, there was no reason why you, as the President of a great and influential League, should not take the step forward. Since then I have been giving this matter my constant attention, and at last I have made up my mind to make a personal appeal to you. I do not, however, pretend to sail under false colours. I represent neither the one party nor the other. I can neither offer nor accept terms. I can only appeal to you in my individual capacity—in the capacity of one who strongly and genuinely holds that the Muslims are an integral part of India and that their willing co-operation with other communities, must necessarily condition the nature, extent and speed of the progress of the country. I am deliberately avoiding all reference to the controversial issues

that divide the one from the other, as it is not for me to settle them, but for you and leaders of other parties, who can influence opinion and speak for others to raise these issues and to come to a settlement in regard to them. As a realist, I feel that not only you but Mr. Gandhi and the leaders of the Hindu Sabha, particularly Dr. Savarkar, are men on whom the primary responsibility for a settlement of those issues lies. Neither speeches on public platforms, nor statements and interviews given by leaders, can really help the situation. I think conversations, or if I may use a hackneyed phrase, heart-to-heart conversations may possibly lead to some satisfactory results. In any case even if they do not, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that everything has been done which could be done, to bring about a better state of feeling and understanding. I am, therefroe, venturing to suggest on my own account, without committing any other person, or any other party, to my views or suggestions that (1) you should agree first to meet Mr. Gandhi, and then the process of private talks could be extended to others. (2) If you and other leaders then think, that it would serve the best interest of the country, to invite a joint conference, then you all could take the necessary stage. I can assure you of my personal support and co-operation in this matter. If your reply to my suggestion is that you will be prepared to see Mr. Gandhi and talk over matters with him, I shall write to him and press it on him that he must see you in Bombay or any other place that may suit your convenience. I hope very strongly that he will be quite willing to see you in Bombay

or any other convenient place and discuss things with you. I think you two should meet first, for if the country is dear to him, I believe, it is no less dear to you. You may be at present identified with the Muslim League. I have no kind of prejudice against the League or any one connected with it, and so far as you are concerned, I still prefer to look upon you as I used to in days gone by when other people also looked up to you, for guidance and advocacy of the cause of India, irrespective of caste, colour or creed.

If you are willing to see Mr. Gandhi and to discuss things I hope you will permit me to take him into confidence about what you write to me.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Tej Bahadur Sapru

* * *

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

Bombay, 10th February, 1941

My dear Sapru,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th instant and thank you for it. I have given to it my closest consideration coming as it does from you.

The main purpose on which you have concentrated is directed towards trying to induce me to agree to see Mr. Gandhi. I am sorry to find

that you are under the impression that I am reluctant and opposed to seeing Mr. Gandhi or any other Hindu leader on behalf of the Hindu community, for you say in your letter that I should agree first to see Mr. Gandhi. Then you proceed to say further, "if your reply to my suggestion is that you will be prepared to see Mr. Gandhi and talk over matters with him I shall write to him and press it upon him that he must see you at Bombay or any other place that may suit your convenience." Please remove this erroneous impression from your mind. I have always been ready and willing to see Mr. Gandhi or any other Hindu leader on behalf of Hindu community and do all I can to help the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem.

As regards other matters in your letter I cannot do better than to send you a press cutting giving full text of my speech that I made in the course of the debate in the Assembly on the Supplementary Finance Bill last November, as I fear that your attention, if at all, could have been drawn only to the A.P. summary that appeared in most of the papers at the time.

This will give you some idea of the position and the point of the Muslim League.

I thank you for your personal references to me which I need not say I appreciate very much.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

Letter from Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to Mr. Jinnah.

Allahabad, 19th February, 1941

My dear Jinnah,

Thank you ever so much for your kind letter of the 10th February. I regret to say that I have been having high fever for the last five or six days and am therefore unable to attend to any political correspondence. As soon as I get better I shall write to you again about the matter about which I wrote to you on the 6th February. I appreciate very much the promptness with which you have so kindly replied to me.

Yours sincerely,

Tej Bahadur Sapru

—o—

SIR ROGER LUMLEY

Letter from Sir Roger Lumley to Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

(Confidential)

Government House,
Ganeshkhind, July 20, 1941

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

His Excellency the Viceroy has asked me to let you know his intentions on the matters which follow. I had hoped that I would be able to see you myself in order that I might convey this message to you personally, as was his desire : but unfortunately, now that I am in a position to give you the message, I am not entirely fit, and I am, therefore, writing to convey it to you by this letter, which I am sending down to Bombay by special messenger.

The Viceroy has continued to have very much in mind the whole situation in regard to the war effort and the association of non-official opinion with the prosecution of the war. The obstacles, however, to any settlement on the basis of the complete offer of August last, which emerged so clearly during the discussions last autumn, still exist, to his very great regret, as the last few months

and the reactions to the Secretary of State's statement in the House of Commons on April 22 have made clear.

In these circumstances, it is equally clear that he cannot look for that degree of support from the major parties, for the proposals embodied in the August offer, which he desires. Nevertheless, the burden of the conduct of the war on the Central Government has greatly increased, and, for administrative reasons, it is essential to proceed with some increase in the membership of the Viceroy's Council within the terms of the August offer. The Viceroy, accordingly, is anxious that you should know that he is now, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, creating five new portfolios.

These new portfolios and the names of the gentlemen by whom they have been accepted are as follows : Supply—Sir Homi Mody; Information—Sir Akbar Hydari; Civil Defence—Mr. Raghavendra Rao; Indians Overseas—Mr. Aney; Labour—Sir Firoz Khan Noon.

The Viceroy would also like you to know that he proposes to fill the vacancies arising in the portfolio of Law when Sir Zafrulla Khan goes to the Federal Court, and in the portfolio of education when Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai takes up a mission overseas by the appointment of Sir Sultan Ahmed and Mr. Sarkar.

In addition, the Viceroy does not feel that,

because of the difficulty in securing the support of the major political parties, it is possible to delay further the more active association of non-official Indian opinion with the prosecution of the war.

He is accordingly establishing with the approval of His Majesty's Government, a National Defence Council. This Council will consist of some 30 members, nine of whom will be drawn from Indian States.

The Viceroy regards it as essential that the Great Muslim community should be represented on that Council by persons of the highest prominence and capacity. He has accordingly invited the Premier of Assam, Bengal, the Punjab and Sind to serve as members of it, and he has extended invitations also to certain other prominent Muslims, such as Sir Mahomed Usman.

He has considered whether he should invite you to let him have any suggestions as to possible personnel for this Council, but being aware, as he is, of your general attitude, he has concluded that it would be preferable not to embarrass you by inviting you to make suggestions.

It is intended that an announcement about these changes will be made on the morning of Tuesday, July 22, and the Viceroy is anxious that you should have through me this advance information of what is proposed. I would have much preferred to have given you this message orally, but this letter contains the substance of it.

I hope that you have now fully recovered from your recent illness.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Lumley

* * *

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to Sir Roger Lumley.

Dear Sir Roger,

I am in receipt of your letter of July 20, 1941, which embodies the message of His Excellency the Viceroy. I deeply regret the decision taken by him with the approval of His Majesty's Government. I appreciate when he says that he does not wish to make suggestions, knowing, as he does, not only my general attitude but that of the All-India Muslim League.

Further I cannot approve of his having invited the Muslim League Premiers or any other Muslim Leaguer under the scheme of the expansion of the Viceroy's Council as well as what is now called the National Defence Council, because it is obvious that it would embarrass the Muslim League organisation. And I do hope and trust that His Excellency will avoid such a contingency.

Besides, it is hardly fair or proper that they should be approached by His Excellency over the head of the President and the Executive of the All-India Muslim League, knowing full well the

position and the attitude that the All-India Muslim League has adopted.

It is stated in his message that the Viceroy regards it as essential that the great Muslim community should be represented by persons of the highest prominence and capacity. Would it be creditable for any individual prominent or capable Muslim belonging to an organisation to accept the invitation contrary to the position and the attitude taken up by that organisation, and would it do any credit to Government if they succeed in alluring him and create a breach in the organisation, in the hope that he may throw up his allegiance to the party to which he belongs in order to accept the invitation of His Excellency.

I maintain that the great Muslim community is represented authoritatively only by the All-India Muslim League organisation. Persistence in this course will not improve matters, but on the contrary it will lead to bitterness on the part of the Muslim League, which up to the present moment, fortunately, does not exist, however emphatically we have disapproved of the policy which has been pursued by His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy.

Before I conclude I am extremely sorry to hear that you are not well and I hope that you will soon recover from your illness.

Thanking you for your kind inquiries, I am now much better.

Yours sincerely,

M. A. Jinnah

* * *

Letter from Sir Roger Lumley to Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

Ganeshkhind, July 22

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of July 21, the contents of which I have passed on to the Viceroy. I am glad to hear you have recovered. Thanks for your kind inquiry, I am much better.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Lumley